

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. LI.

MARCH, 1831.

ON THE EVIDENCE OF THE RESURRECTION.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THERE may be nothing in the following considerations on the Evidence of the Resurrection, which has not been already and better stated by others ; but they have at least the merit of being a faithful transcript of the firm convictions of a mind that has reflected with much earnestness on the subject. In the humble hope that the language of deep and sincere belief may prove efficacious in some few instances to excite the attention and confirm the faith of the serious inquirer after truth, I submit them to the candid judgment of your readers.

PHILALETHES MANCUNIENSIS.

What constitutes a Christian believer, in the strictest sense ? Simply reverencing the moral character and adopting the moral principles of Christ ? Or is the acknowledgment of his supernatural powers and divine authority indispensable to our properly assuming the appellation ? Christianity, in its indirect influences, has so generally improved and elevated the moral sentiments of mankind, that numbers partake of its spirit, and so far, we hope and believe, fulfil its intentions, who have not examined, or who do not admit the evidences of its miraculous origin : and this diffusion of its moral power, even amongst those who are unconscious of the obligation, is a fact in which every friend to the well-being and happiness of man must heartily rejoice. It cannot, however, be denied, that something more than this general sympathy with the moral tendencies of the gospel is distinctly required by the language of the New Testament, as the test of a proper belief in Christ. The apostles propagated by their preaching the religion which their Master had planted ; and their whole testimony bore directly on this one fact, that Christ, in the fulfilment of his divine mission, had risen from the dead. Whoever admits their testimony in this essential point, is converted by their preaching and becomes a Christian. Whoever disputes or denies the fact, thus strongly and unanimously asserted by them, must

conceive their whole preaching to be founded on a delusion, and that they have transmitted to us a false impression of the character and office of Christ.

It behoves every one, therefore, to examine the apostolic testimony to this fact with the closest attention and the strictest impartiality ; since on the credibility of that testimony rests the solution of the important question, whether Christianity is to be considered of divine, or of merely human, origin. The admission of the resurrection, with all the inferences deducible from it, constitutes the faith of a Christian in the strict and proper sense. When the evidence of that event has once been rendered conclusive to the mind, less difficulty will be felt in admitting the other miracles of the Scripture history. If we can only bring ourselves to believe that Christ actually rose from the dead, we may claim our part in the blessings and privileges of the gospel covenant.

Before entering on the examination of the evidence of this fact, let us premise a few words on the value of human testimony, and on the limits by which some have contended it must be circumscribed.

A reliance on the uniformity of causation—in other words, the assumption, that like causes will always produce like effects—is the criterion of all evidence, and the foundation of all belief, in regard both to moral and to physical events. We confidently expect a certain result under given circumstances, because we have always found it occur ; and if the result varies from what we anticipated, we conclude at once, that some change has taken place in the foregoing circumstances, of which we were not aware. Under given circumstances, we place the most implicit trust in the testimony of individuals, because, in those circumstances, we have never known them deceive or be deceived.

This fundamental principle, implied in all our reasonings and expectations, has been recently illustrated with great force and beauty by the author of *Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, &c.* ; and it is indeed impossible to contest it, as soon as ever the terms in which it is stated are clearly understood. To one of the illustrations, however, adopted by this ingenious writer, in weighing the force of human testimony against an assumed contrariety to the uniformity of physical causation, we feel ourselves compelled to demur. In reference to the disposition of mankind, on particular occasions, to place a disproportionate trust in human testimony, he observes,* and justly, that the force of that testimony rests on the very same principle on which the evidence of physical facts is admitted, viz. that like causes will always produce like effects ; and he adds, “ it not unfrequently happens that, while external circumstances tend to confirm the testimony, the nature and circumstances of the facts attested render it highly improbable that any such facts should have taken place, and these two sets of circumstances may be so exactly equivalent as to leave the mind in irremediable doubt.” He supposes a case,† in which “ a great number of people—people too of reputation, science, and perspicacity,” with “ no motive for falsehood,” with “ discernment to perceive, and honesty to tell the real truth,” “ whose interests would essentially suffer from any departure from veracity,” bear their “ concurrent testimony” to the fact of having seen “ a cubic inch of ice exposed to a temperature of 200 degrees of Fahrenheit,” and of having found “ at the expiration of an hour that it retained its solidity.” In this case, he contends that the unexceptionable character of the testimony could

* Essay III. pp. 255, 256.

† Ibid. pp. 257, 258.

not overcome the alleged repugnance of the fact to the laws of nature, and render it credible. Is he justified in that opinion? With deference to the judgment of so able a writer, we humbly conceive not. Under the circumstances supposed, it seems impossible that testimony should be false. Are we then to admit a suspension of the uniformity of causation—in other words, an effect without a cause? Most assuredly not: but we submit that, in this case, our knowledge of the laws of the human mind lies more within our compass, and must be more complete, than our knowledge of the laws and agencies of nature; and that if an effect, like the one supposed, were actually attested in the way supposed, it must have arisen from some unknown cause having been called into operation, some new element or principle having been introduced into the foregoing circumstances, which had changed their character, but which had escaped the attention of the observers. To adopt any other conclusion, would seem to imply that there could be no laws of nature, no modes of divine agency, but what had fallen under our own notice, to bind the Deity by rules that we had deduced from a narrow survey of his works, and to measure the possibilities of creation by the limited results of our own experience. It is true, that the fixed and constant uniformity of causation is what first leads us to the acknowledgment of a Supreme Intelligence; but, when we have thus arrived at the knowledge of that First Cause, when the regularity and harmony of creation have compelled us to have recourse to a Creator, we can reason downwards from God to his works and his laws, and instead of supposing them to subsist in their present order and connexion from any inherent necessity, can view them as the spontaneous effects and voluntary combinations of his comprehensive wisdom and universal providence. That there is in some minds, and in certain periods of society, an unthinking and incautious proneness to rely on human testimony, is at once admitted; but there has also existed, and there still exists, in the world—perhaps the result of a resiliency against the former state of mind, and one of the collateral effects of a too exclusive cultivation of the exact sciences and the inductive philosophy—as unreasonable an incredulity in the best attested facts that have not chanced to coincide with the actual tenor of recorded experience. Testimony does not spring up of its own accord; it results from determinate causes, and is governed by determinate laws; nor are we at liberty to dispute the facts, to the existence of which it clearly and steadily points, though we may be unable to account satisfactorily for their origin.

Let us now consider the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus. We assume, without hesitation, the authenticity and general credibility of the books of the New Testament. Whatever view be taken of the miraculous in their narratives, no rational doubt can any longer be entertained by persons of competent information, that those books have come down from the first age of Christianity, and that they contain a faithful representation of the character and teachings of Christ, and of the testimony borne to him by the apostles. The genuineness of the writings of John and of most of the Epistles of Paul, is universally admitted. The Acts of the Apostles is unanimously ascribed to Luke, and may be traced back to the apostolic age. Should we even admit that the three first gospels are not independent authorities, but have drawn their materials from a common source, yet that common source is referred by Eichhorn, the most fearless and sagacious of inquirers, to the very commencement of the Christian dispensation, and is supposed by him to have contained all the leading incidents of the public ministry of Jesus, including his *resurrection*, and our Lord's *prophetic an-*

nouncement of that wonderful event.* We appeal, then, with confidence to these books, as authentic witnesses of what Christ and his apostles did and taught: and we assume, on the present occasion, not the miraculous, but only the common historical incidents of the gospel narrative, and we are prepared to shew that, if these common incidents be admitted, the fact of the resurrection cannot be consistently denied.

The fact of the resurrection forms, if we may so express it, the boundary line between the ministry of Christ and that of his apostles, between the periods of apostolic darkness and of apostolic illumination: and there are circumstances connected with this distinction, which appear to be irreconcilable with any other supposition than that of the truth of the fact. What occurred before the fact, and the language of Christ during his ministry, have not perhaps been duly considered as affording a most powerful indirect evidence, when combined with the subsequent testimony of the apostles, of the fact's having actually taken place. Christ repeatedly and solemnly foretold his crucifixion and resurrection; and these predictions became more solemn and more distinct, as the termination of his ministry approached.

Now, let us consider what this implies. The natural tendency of events might doubtless have led a mind, less reflecting and sagacious than that of Jesus, considered merely as a human reformer, to anticipate the fate which he experienced from his unrelenting persecutors. But why couple with this anticipation the prophecy of an ensuing event, the non-fulfilment of which must necessarily have exposed his pretensions to ridicule, and blasted every prospect of perpetuating the influence of his principles after his death? How inconsistent these fanatical assurances of a resurrection from the dead on the third day, with the calm and practical wisdom by which Christ's ordinary conduct and the general strain of his teachings were distinguished! Besides, these assurances produced no present effect; and their intention can only be explained with reference to a future time, when events should have declared their meaning and pointed out their application. They created no present feeling in favour of Christ. The disciples, whose minds were engrossed by the splendid visions of a temporal Messiah, hardly perceived the tendency of his allusions, and, so far as they did perceive them, were rather revolted than encouraged by them. Such declarations, when they reached the ears of his enemies, were treated with the utmost scorn. "Sir," said the Chief Priests and Pharisees to Pilate, when they were soliciting a guard for the sepulchre, "we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again."

Such was the feeling of the unbelieving portion of the Jewish public: and, when we consider the inability of the disciples to realize to themselves the possibility of their Master's death and resurrection, and their slowness to comprehend the spiritual nature of his kingdom, we can only account for the fact of Christ's thus gratuitously exposing himself to contempt, misconception, and unpopularity, by admitting that his mind was divinely possessed with the assurance that for such a fate he actually was destined, that he should die and should rise again, and that, in declaring this, he felt himself the organ of the Holy Spirit, whose presages coming events, he was convinced, would verify.

Let us now pass over the mysterious, and as yet inexplicable, circumstances which followed the crucifixion; and consider the views and feelings, the constant and concurring declarations, of the very same men, who, prior

* *Einleitung, &c.*, § 37. *Umfang des Urevaug.* 28—44.

to those circumstances, seemed unable to comprehend the meaning of a resurrection, and believed that it was the sole office of the Messiah to restore a temporal kingdom to Israel. Their minds, from some cause or other, have evidently undergone a remarkable change. From being highly carnal, they have become eminently spiritual. Instead of shuddering at the idea of their Master's death and its attendant circumstances, they expatiate on it with enthusiasm, and make it the basis of their teachings, and the central point of their testimony. Instead of sinking, disheartened and despairing, beneath the total failure of their hopes of a temporal kingdom, they seem inspired with a new courage and confidence, entertaining the firmest conviction of their Lord's having passed into some invisible state, and anticipating his return at no very distant period to raise the dead and to judge the world. With the precise correctness of this last opinion, we have, at present, no concern; it does not compromise the truth of Christianity; we have only to examine the evidence of the facts from which it flowed, as a natural consequence in the then existing state of the public mind.

If we turn to the apostles' own account of this extraordinary change, we find them ascribing it distinctly to the resurrection. Peter, and James, and John, who had been witnesses of this great event, were the first to announce it, in all their preachings, recorded in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. And let us here recollect the previous incredulity of the eleven, when the women reported what they had seen at the sepulchre; an incredulity which Peter overcame (Luke xxiv. 12) only by running, with his characteristic eagerness, to the sepulchre, where, "stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and" then "departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." Let us remember the still more solemn, direct, and explicit testimony of John, who was with Jesus through the whole of the transactions preceding and attending the crucifixion; who saw him pierced on the cross; who accompanied Simon Peter to the sepulchre, on the report of the women; and who has described this whole occurrence in language bearing the strongest impress of truth and reality (John xx. 4—9): "So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter, following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed. For as yet," i. e. up to that time, "they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." We must further keep in mind, that John adds to the striking declaration contained in the foregoing words, that, on several occasions subsequent to this, he had actually seen the risen Jesus,* and been the subject of a conversation between Jesus and Simon Peter, at which he himself was present. "This," says he emphatically, "is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true."

Lastly, there is the remarkable testimony of Paul — of Paul, the bigot and

* May not the singular language at the opening of John's First Epistle, "that which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have *looked upon*, and our *hands have handled*, of the word of life," be most naturally interpreted as an animated reference on the part of the Apostle to the sensible evidence which he had enjoyed of the actual, *bodily* resurrection of the Lord Jesus?

the persecutor ; whose conversion was not the slow result of inquiry and progressive conviction, but complete and instantaneous ; inexplicable, with all its attendant circumstances, on any other supposition than that of his having been favoured with a manifestation of the personal presence of the risen Jesus, to which he himself continually referred as the cause of his conversion, and as the circumstance which qualified him for exercising the apostolic office.

Now, let us reflect, for one moment, on the peculiar nature of this testimony : from whom does it proceed ? From men of the most widely-different temperaments, and of views, in some points, almost conflicting—from men, taking the most opposite direction in the labour of propagating the new religion—from Peter and James, who were connected with the Jewish party, and the latter of whom presided in the infant church at Jerusalem—from Paul, the eloquent and enlightened opponent of the invidious distinction of Jew and Gentile—from John, the rapt and contemplative seer, whose enthusiastic spirit loved to range amongst the sublime, but vague, abstractions of the oriental school—from men, who, however much they disagreed on minor points, were unanimous in their testimony to the resurrection of Christ—a fact, of which their senses had been the judge, and which was made by each of them the basis of reasonings, illustrations, and inferences, shaped and modified by the peculiar bias and tendency of their respective minds.

It is impossible to resist the acute and learned arguments with which Dr. Middleton* has shewn that the same reasoning and the same testimony by which the Christian miracles of the second and third centuries are attempted to be proved, might equally well be alleged on behalf of the numberless miracles asserted by the Catholic Church down to the present day ; and it may, perhaps, be thought that his arguments are capable of being extended to the miracles of the New Testament, notwithstanding the line which he has himself clearly drawn between the apostolic age and that which ensued. The sole fact, be it remembered, with which we are now concerned, is the fact of the resurrection ; and we may fearlessly assert, that this fact stands on ground peculiar to itself, and is entrenched within a pile of evidence, with which that of no other miraculous incident, not only of the times subsequent to the apostles, but we may even add of the apostolic age itself, will admit of being compared.

When the fashion of miracles, so to speak, had been once introduced, and when the system, on behalf of which they were alleged to be wrought, was previously believed to be true, there was a general readiness among believers to admit them on very insufficient evidence ; and even men of learning and character, partly perhaps deceived, and partly perhaps in accordance with the mistaken morality of those times, inclined to stretch a point in support of influences which they thought might be useful—too easily lent the sanction of their names to marvellous narratives, the correctness of which they had not taken sufficient pains to examine, and which possibly they might not be over-anxious to find untrue. But we may appeal to the candour of every reader of the New Testament, whether these circumstances are at all applicable to the great miracle of Christ's resurrection. When Christ appeared, there had been a long cessation of miraculous interpositions. John the Baptist wrought no miracles. From the days of the last of the prophets up to the advent of Christ himself, no religious teacher had

* *Free Inquiry, &c., Works, 8vo., Vol. I.*

appeared, claiming divine authority and attesting that claim by the evidence of miracles. With Christ, therefore, commenced, as it were, a new series of miraculous agency : and the very attempt, subsequently to the apostolic age, to perpetuate that series by fictitious miracles, seems almost to imply that it must have had its origin, after so long a suspension, in those which were true. The miracles of Christ, moreover, were all performed for purposes, and in support of views, directly contrary to the received opinions and strongest prepossessions of his countrymen. The miracle of the resurrection, in particular, had the singular fate of being most strongly opposed to the views, and most revolting to the feelings, that were generally entertained by the disciples during the life-time of Jesus, and of producing, after his death, precisely that change in their minds which fitted them to be the preachers of his religion. There was no predominant prejudice in the public mind which could have encouraged Jesus to excite the expectation of such an event taking place, or which could have induced his disciples to hope for ready belief and general favour from spreading the rumour that it had actually occurred.

Besides, how unique, how unaccountable, is the whole language and conduct of Christ in regard to this event ! A man foretells his own death and resurrection ; grounds his whole claim to divine authority on the fulfilment of this prediction ; and constitutes it the basis on which the whole superstructure of his future religion is to be reared. Surely nothing parallel to this can be found in any one of the miracles that are recorded in the succeeding ages of the church. All the apostles, wherever they preached, and whatever might be their other views, had but one story respecting their Master's resurrection from the dead. Their testimony was borne, not to what they *believed* to be the correctness of *opinions*, but to what they *knew* to be the truth of *facts* : and in consequence of this conviction, so contrary to their previous expectation, they renounced their former opinions, changed their mode of life, and conceived the extraordinary project of going forth to proselytize the world.

Here, then, is a most extraordinary chain of events, a most unaccountable accumulation of testimony. On what does that chain hang ? What can be the nucleus of that accumulation ? Those who reject the resurrection are bound to assign some probable, at least some possible, cause of events, so sudden in their origin, so peculiar in their character, and so lasting in their consequences. Till that be done, we may rest, without any great presumption, in the fact of the resurrection, as affording the most satisfactory solution of all the phenomena of the case.

It never can be sufficiently repeated, that what we require from the apostles is their testimony to this fact. Incalculable difficulties are entailed on Christianity by expecting from it more than it is intended to furnish. The essential truths of Christ's religion are to be gathered from the spirit of his teachings, combined with all the inferences deducible from the fact of his resurrection. With their steadfast testimony to this fact, the apostles join, in the further exercise of their divine commission, the most solemn announcements of a judgment to come, and the most affectionate exhortations to repentance towards God, and the cultivation of vital holiness and spirituality of mind : but they reason upon, apply, and illustrate the facts and doctrines included in their commission, in their own way : the actual exhibition of them to the world passes through the medium of their peculiar views, and is adapted to the existing opinions of their age. Their minds were the earliest vehicles through which the spirit of Christianity was trans-

mitted by its author to future generations; and that spirit, guided and cherished by the protecting providence of God, will go on, as we believe and trust, increasing in purity and strength through all the future channels by which it is destined to be distributed to the remotest corners of the earth.

One word as to the nature of the fact itself. Why should it be considered incredible, when supported by competent testimony? Is there not a power in the universe adequate to its production? How else shall we account for the original creation of the human race?—a fact in itself as stupendous, and as much disconnected from foregoing circumstances, as the resurrection—and yet the certainty of which may indisputably be inferred from the most conspicuous phenomena of the globe that we inhabit. Those who embrace the doctrines of natural religion and hope for a future life, must admit the possibility of a transference of individual consciousness to a new system of organization: and may not this transference be a change which, though invisible to us, does constantly take place on the dissolution of our present bodies by death, and form a permanent law of that region of the spiritual universe which is placed beyond the sphere of our present experience? And if this *transference* of consciousness be conceived of as possible, why should not the *restoration* of it, after a short interval, to its previous system of organization, be equally admitted to be possible; and thus the resurrection be merely the *visible* manifestation to *our* world of the operation of a law which is continually taking place in the *unseen* and *spiritual* world; a manifestation ordained by the Cause of causes for the best of purposes, and in perfect harmony with the great final object of his universal providence, the education of mind, and the advancement of the virtue and happiness of the human race?

It will be objected, that such an event is a deviation from the usual course of God's providence, and is therefore incredible. But such an objection implies, that our present knowledge of the laws of nature must limit the range of possibility. For aught we can now prove to the contrary, such apparent deviations may be only parts of some great system, as yet unknown to us, the exemplification of a law affecting the whole spiritual creation, but too vast and too comprehensive to fall within the survey and be subject to the calculations of the shortsighted inhabitants of a transitory planet like ours. Beings, who had never witnessed nor heard of more than one comet or one eclipse, would doubtless regard them as violations of the established order of nature, and call such appearances miraculous: whereas we now know, from longer experience, that they are essential parts of the general economy of creation, and depend on causes as determinate as those which influence the tides of the ocean and the course of the seasons.* The same we may hereafter find to be the case with the resurrection, and with those other wonderful events by which God in different ages and under various dispensations has specially helped forward the moral and religious progress of the human species. In a future world, we may possibly be enabled to trace the mysterious ties which link the present initiatory existence of man with the higher laws of the spiritual universe, and connect it with the nobler functions and capacities of a state that has yet to be revealed.

Still it will be asked by the pertinacious objector, why, if an event so important as that of the visible resurrection of a human being from the dead ever took place—why is not the evidence of it more decisive and complete?

* Some excellent observations on this subject will be found at the close of the third Letter in Bishop Watson's Apology for Christianity addressed to Mr. Gibbon.

This objection will have little weight with those who find in the evidence enough to satisfy their own minds. Dr. Priestley, in his celebrated Discourse on this subject, has advanced some very probable reasons why Jesus was not seen by a greater number of persons after his resurrection. But to say nothing of the moral influences of cultivating *faith* as distinct from knowledge, we may observe that, historically speaking, the doctrine of the resurrection, considered as an essential part of Christianity, has accomplished its great object; it has diffused amongst mankind a rational and popular belief in a future life; it has excited such discussion and interest in the subject, both among those who do, and those who do not, admit the resurrection of Jesus, that it has called forth the whole force of the natural arguments for human immortality, and fixed them on their right basis—not nice and subtle disquisitions on the essence of mind—the rock on which the ancient philosophers split—but on those moral views, which Christianity inculcates, and which it has spread universally through society, of the character of God and the progressive destiny of man.

The truths of Christianity seem well fitted to form a rallying point for good men of all sects and parties in this age of agitation and excitement; and these truths cluster round the fact of the resurrection as a sort of nucleus, which gives them consistency and strength. It is the visible link between earth and heaven—

“Connexion exquisite of distant worlds.”

It attaches our best hopes and fondest wishes to that bright world unseen—the mansion of all that is pure and great and good—where the visions of the patriot, the dreams of the philanthropist, and the aspirations of the saint, may fashion to themselves some unapproachable ideal of perfection to exalt the aims and sanctify the toils of earth.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON AN ANTITRINITARIAN.

WE are not among those who care not what company they are found in, whether at home or abroad, in the world or in the church. Truth, we know, to find acceptance, must be recommended in its living forms, and therefore for the truth's sake, with a view to its extension and final triumph, we rejoice when we can add to the list of our friends another illustrious name. And of pride, or apathy, or ignorance of the world, we should suspect that man who disowned any wish to find enrolled among the votaries of his faith the greatly good and greatly wise. There is a triumvirate, of whom Unitarians may well be proud, and of whom neither the indifference of friends nor the assaults of enemies can, we feel convinced, ever rob them—we mean Milton, Newton, and Locke. That the first and the last were Antitrinitarians seems now to be conceded on all hands. A doubt has been raised about our claim to Newton, and we therefore propose to set forth in order the proofs that Sir Isaac Newton *was an Antitrinitarian*.

The manner in which men of research and information have spoken on this subject merits attention. “He adhered,” says the writer of the article Newton, in Rees' Cyclopædia, “outwardly to the communion of the Church of England, though he did not believe in all its doctrines; with respect to

the person of Christ there seems no doubt that Sir Isaac Newton was inclined to Unitarianism." Chalmers, in his Biographical Dictionary, tells us that "he not only shewed a great and constant regard to religion in general, as well by an exemplary life as in all his writings, but was also a firm believer in revealed religion, with one exception, an important one indeed, that his sentiments on the doctrine of the Trinity by no means coincided with what is generally held." That most respectable authority, Dr. Thomson, asserts, in his History of the Royal Society, "Newton's religious opinions were not orthodox—for example, he did not believe in the Trinity. This gives us the reason why Horsley, (the Editor of his works,) the champion of the Trinity, found Newton's papers unfit for publication. But it is much to be regretted they never saw the light." Dr. Chalmers will not be suspected of favouring the Unitarians, yet he has given the sanction of his authority to Newton's Antitrinitarianism. In the second of his "Discourses on the Christian Revelation viewed in connexion with the Modern Astronomy," he has pronounced a splendid and well-deserved eulogium on Newton as a biblical student. Lest he should hence be charged with Unitarianizing, he softens the matter down in his preface, and tells his readers, "I do not think that amid the distraction and the engrossment of other pursuits he has at all times succeeded in his interpretation of the book, (the Bible,) else he would never, in my apprehension, have abetted the leading doctrine of a sect or system which has now nearly dwindled away from public observation."

As next in value, we shall place the evidence of his Antitrinitarianism deducible from Newton's works.

There is in them an entire absence of all evidence that the writer believed in either the Trinity or the Deity of Christ. Silence on these subjects is universal and unbroken. Had it been, as we think it was, Newton's design to omit any thing that could, by any possibility, be construed into a belief in the Trinity, he could not have avoided the subject more cautiously and successfully than he has done. Occasions present themselves when, if such had been his belief, he could hardly have done otherwise than imply or declare the truth of the Trinitarian doctrine. But he is profoundly silent. Would, *could* a Trinitarian have acted in this way? Is he not, with propriety, styled an Antitrinitarian who so far opposes the doctrine as to withhold from it all countenance in his works? Is it unfair to presume that he wished that to disappear from the face of society which he sedulously excluded from his own pages? Newton was a Christian, and wrote as a Christian on Christian topics, and if he had held the Trinity, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity in the opinion of its advocates, how could he have been guilty of omitting the mention of it, especially when there are passages, as we shall now shew, which imply his disbelief of the doctrine?

The bare fact, that he exposed "Two notable Corruptions of Scripture," which have been considered main supports of Trinitarianism, would not lead to the inference that he was an Antitrinitarian; but that fact, coupled with another, viz. his omitting to declare, in the same tract as that in which he destroyed two witnesses, his belief in the doctrine, does warrant the conclusion, that he was opposed as much to the corruption of the Trinity itself as to the corruptions by which it had for centuries been supported. No serious believer in the Trinity would, we are persuaded, have written to take away evidence on behalf of the Trinity without declaring that he designed no ill to the doctrine itself—nay, was persuaded that the warrant of Scripture was still in its favour. A distinction would have been made between the

doctrine and the evidence of the doctrine, asserting his conviction of the stability and certainty of the first, while duty obliged him to detect flaws in the second. We go farther. Language occurs in the treatise on the "Two notable Corruptions of Scripture," which implies, in the clearest manner, Newton's disbelief of the doctrine in question. Page 8, he says, speaking of the baptismal form, "the place from which they *tried* at first to derive the Trinity." This phrase even Horsley found to be "very extraordinary." And extraordinary, nay, unaccountable, it is, if Sir Isaac Newton was, as Horsley intimates, "no Socinian," or, as we should choose to term it, not an Antitrinitarian. In the following, the reasons assigned of the Sonship of Christ fall far below the height of orthodoxy. P. 59, "'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God ;' that Son spoken of in the Psalms, when he saith, 'Thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee.' This is he that, after the Jews had long expected him, came, first in a mortal body by baptism of water, and then in an immortal one by shedding his blood upon the cross, and rising again from the dead, not by water only, but by water and blood ; *being* the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead, (Acts xiii. 33,) as by his supernatural birth of the virgin (Luke i. 35)." A Trinitarian would have gone much farther, and spoken of his being begotten from eternity, and even an Arian would have spoken of his creation as taking place before all worlds. No one but a Humanitarian could with propriety have referred the Sonship of Christ merely to his supernatural birth and resurrection. Let the tenor of the next passage, page 61, be considered. Speaking of the want of congruity there is in it, with the Apostle's drift, he says of the text of the three heavenly witnesses, "How does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse ? Let them make good sense of it who are able. For my part, I can make none. If it be said that we are not to determine what is Scripture, and what not, by our private judgments ; I confess it, in places not controverted ; but in disputable places, I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries, and for that reason to like best what they understand least. Such men may use the Apostle John as they please, but I have that honour for him as to believe that he wrote good sense, and therefore take that sense to be his which is the best." Is this the tone of a Trinitarian ? Was he, who was not "fond of mysteries," likely to be enamoured with the mystery of mysteries, the Trinity, at which, we learn, on authority, "reason stands aghast, and faith itself is half confounded" ? Sir Isaac Newton had studied in a different school. Had he believed in the Trinity, would he not, after this passage, have precluded misconstruction, by asserting, as we find so often done, that there were mysteries in Christianity, mysteries to be believed, mysteries to prove the believer's faith, to exercise his trust, to humble his "reasoning pride," and, above all, proudly eminent, the mystery of the Trinity ? Again, in p. 65, we read, "In all the times of the hot and lasting Arian controversy, it (1 Tim. iii. 16) never came into play ; though now these disputes are over, they that read, 'God manifested in the flesh,' think it one of the *most obvious and pertinent texts for the business.*" Let Sir Isaac Newton's piety and gentleness be considered, and then say if *he* could have used language such as this of a fundamental doctrine of revelation, of any thing but what he believed a gross and injurious corruption of the gospel. It is quite clear that the mind of the writer was, to say no more, in a state of alienation both from the evidence and the doctrine which that

evidence was adduced to support. Much of the same character is the oblique thrust in the following passage, page 62: "*When they had got the Trinity into his (Erasmus') edition, (they) threw by their manuscript, if they had one, as an almanac out of date. And can such shuffling dealings satisfy considering men?*" It would be easy to add many passages implying Newton's disbelief in the Trinity, taken from his published writings. We shall, however, content ourselves at present with the following, extracted from his piece on the Apocalypse: "The beasts and the elders represent the primitive Christians of all nations, and the worship of these Christians in their churches is here represented under the form of worshiping God and the Lamb in the temple: God for his benefaction in creating all things, and the Lamb for his benefaction in redeeming us with his blood: God as sitting upon the throne and living for ever, and the Lamb as exalted above all by the merits of his death. This was the worship of the primitive Christians." Vol. V. p. 455, Horsley's edition. Let this passage be read again. Its evidence appears to us decisive. The Holy Ghost is omitted, the Trinity is omitted. The grounds of the worship assigned ascribe to God supremacy, "sitting on the throne;" eternity, "living for ever;" the peculiarly divine function of creation, "creating all things." The grounds assigned take from Christ all pretensions to equality or identity with God. Why is he worshiped? For creating us? No; that is ascribed to God: but for redeeming us *with his blood*, and as *having been exalted* by the merits of his death. A clear and studied distinction is kept up between God and Christ; and while the essential attributes of Deity are ascribed to the first, the functions of a creature, highly honoured it is true, but of a creature, are asserted of the second. It may be urged, "they are both worshiped." Yes, and so were "God and the King." Worship has been paid to myriads of creatures, as the Old and the New Testament declares. Socinus, though a Humanitarian, worshiped Christ. And doubtless there is a homage due from all Christians to their Saviour, which, if you will, you may designate by the ambiguous term worship. And that the term worship did not, in the mind of Newton, intend the same when applied to the homage paid to God and that to Christ, is very clear from the careful distinction which he makes throughout the passage. He that was worshiped, because the Creator and Supreme and Eternal Ruler of all, received a very different service from that offered to him who had been faithful unto death in man's cause, and for his fidelity was honoured and exalted of the Deity.

The strongest evidence yet remains.

Hopton Haynes, the intimate friend of Newton, asserted that "Sir Isaac Newton did not believe our Saviour's pre-existence, being a Socinian (as we call it) in that article; that Sir Isaac much lamented Dr. Clarke's embracing Arianism, which opinion he feared had been and still would be, if maintained by learned men, a great obstruction to the progress of Christianity." On the same authority, we know that Sir Isaac predicted that "the time will come when the doctrine of the Incarnation, as commonly received, shall be exploded as an absurdity equal to transubstantiation." From Hopton Haynes we turn to Whiston, who succeeded Newton in the professorship at Cambridge. In two passages Whiston declares that Newton was an Antitrinitarian. Page 206, *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. William Whiston*, the autobiographer says, "I found that Sir Isaac Newton was so hearty for the Baptists, as well as for the Eusebians or Arians, that he sometimes suspected these two were the two witnesses in the Revelation" Again, p. 477, "And so far I know concerning you, my brethren, of the Baptists, that the greatest

man our nation ever bred, Sir Isaac Newton, my predecessor at Cambridge, who, with me, looked for those happy times, as to incline to suppose the EUSEBIANS and BAPTISTS, notwithstanding their present low estate, to be the two famous witnesses in the Revelation against Popery and Antichristianism." Whiston asserts the same, at least once more in his works. Here, then, we have the testimony of two most credible and competent witnesses to the Antitrinitarianism of Newton, and one of these declares the fact at three different times, and all in print. Whiston himself was intimate with Newton. He was also intimate with Dr. Clarke, who was intimate with Newton. Hopton Haynes also was in constant and friendly intercourse with the great philosopher, and both declare on their own knowledge that Newton was not a Trinitarian. Can evidence be stronger? Who can impeach the honesty of either of the witnesses? Honesty has become a part of Whiston's name, and we speak of honest Will. Whiston as familiarly as of Alexander the Great or Scipio Africanus. And against the character of Haynes, not a breath of suspicion has been breathed.—We have not yet done. The anonymous author of a pamphlet of some repute, who wrote about twenty years after Sir Isaac's death, affords evidence of the same fact, and would lead us to conclude that in his day the Antitrinitarianism of Newton was a matter of public notoriety.

The evidence now adduced might, we do not doubt, be multiplied by the publication of some of the papers that Horsley proscribed. And we should especially like to explore the contents of the pieces with the following titles: several on "Church History," "Questions concerning Athanasius," "The Philosophical Progress of the Great Mystery," "An Account of the Corruptions of Scripture." By the recent publication of Milton on Christian Doctrine, and Lord King's Life of Locke, the question of their sentiments on the Trinity is for ever decided. Such, we doubt not, would be the effect if the Earl of Portsmouth would imitate Lord King, and give the world an opportunity of seeing some of those things which, with no little presumption, Horsley declared unfit for publication. Fully are we convinced that Newton could write nothing unfit for publication in a literary point of view, least of all, with the exception of mathematics, least of all, on biblical and ecclesiastical matters. "Unfit" many things might appear to Horsley, because *unsuited* to promote his theological views.

In intimating that the publication of the suppressed papers would for ever decide the question of Newton's religious sentiments, we did not design to express the slightest doubt of the validity of the evidence we already possess. That evidence satisfies our mind. In the words of Mr. Lindsey, we express our conviction, "that he was a Unitarian Christian there can be no doubt." But a multiplication of witnesses, and perhaps the Philosopher's own declaration, would serve to preclude any more objections such as those to which we must now give a passing notice. They are taken from an article entitled, "Was Sir Isaac Newton a Unitarian?" published in an American work, distinguished for its bitterness against Unitarians, designated, "The Spirit of the Pilgrims," and republished in an English periodical scarcely less distinguished in the same way—a work known in *malam partem* by our readers—"The Congregational Magazine"—number for December, 1830. The correctness of the assertion, that in the treatise on Two notable Corruptions of Scripture, "no evidence is furnished that he (Sir Isaac) was not *sincerely* a Trinitarian," our readers will, from what has been said, be able to appreciate.

There is, the objector alleges, a contradiction between the statements of

Whiston and Haynes. Whiston makes Newton an Arian, Haynes a Socinian. Granted; but they both make him an Antitrinitarian, and this is all we have contended for, and all we see reason to determine. But the objection is not valid except it can be shewn that they both speak of the same time. Newton might be an Arian at one period, and a Socinian (that is Humanitarian) at another period of his life. The change from the first to the second, increasing years have often brought. And Whiston, who speaks of Newton's Arianism, was not familiar with him in the latter part of his life. Let us grant that the objection has force. What does it establish? Only that Sir Isaac Newton was not very explicit in entering into the minutiae of his religious creed; which all who knew his character will find no great difficulty in admitting. As to the veracity of the witnesses, that remains unimpeached by the objection. They are honest men we know. What they say, then, must be substantially correct. Differ their statements may in particulars, and so do the statements of the Evangelists. He attended on Trinitarian worship, and therefore was a Trinitarian. So did Whiston himself for the greater part of his life. Was he, therefore, a Trinitarian? Is it not known that now even thousands attend the Church-of-England services who believe as little of its creeds as Newton did of Leibnitz' theories? But, then, Newton was not an honest man. Not too fast, I prithee, my objecting friend. If thou hadst had before thy eyes the penalties which Trinitarians had just exacted from the legislature against their heretical brethren, thou mightest have thought it well to temper thy zeal with prudence. Beside, Sir Isaac Newton was a lover of peace, and thought the essence of religion to consist in mutual love and devout affections. Even in defending his philosophical novelties, he lost much of his peace of mind, and lamented (with no small reason) that in the pursuit of a shadow he had lost a substance. Perhaps if thou hadst had as much to endure as he, thou wouldest have feared that another and a heavy load would have been too much for thy shoulders. That the question of secession was, at the time of Newton, a perplexing one, is evident from the following passage out of Whiston's Memoirs: "With what church or sect the Arians, in this present corrupted state of things, ought to communicate till it pleases God more completely to reform the Christian world? Whether with that established, or whether they ought to separate and go over to the Dissenters? as many Arian ministers are supposed to be among them. *Now had the Unitarians the liberty of public assemblies and a ministry of their own, the point would easily then be determined.* To speak the truth, I think their case a little hard; for, while all sects and opinions are tolerated, they alone are denied this happy privilege, *which so many good men wish for.*" This is part of a letter addressed to Whiston, seeking his advice. He replies in substance, that though he had long communicated with the church established, shewing his dislike to what he did not believe; yet, "I do not think," he adds, "I shall easily satisfy myself to do so any more. I mean, if he who officiates is a reader of the horrible Athanasian creed, and by consequence frequently and solemnly pronounces me, and the rest of the Eusebians or primitive Christians, accursed."

Newton, it is affirmed, was offended at Whiston's declaring him an Arian, so much so, as to prevent his being elected a member of the Royal Society. That Newton prevented Whiston's election, Whiston himself declares; but the same authority assigns the reason. These are his words: "If the reader desire to know the reason of Sir Isaac Newton's unwillingness to have me a member, he must take notice, that as his making me first his deputy,

and giving me the full profits of the place, brought me to be a candidate ; as his recommendation of me to the heads of colleges in Cambridge made me his successor ; so did I enjoy a large portion of his favour for twenty years together. But he then perceiving that I could not do as his other darling friends did, that is, learn of him, without contradicting him when I differed in opinion from him, he could not, in his old age, bear such contradiction, and so he was afraid of me the last thirteen years of his life.—He was of the most fearful, cautious, and suspicious temper that I ever knew.” This is the account of the affair which Whiston himself gave, who surely ought to have best known all the circumstances. But the writer in “*The Spirit of the Pilgrims*” ascribes Whiston’s rejection to his having declared Newton an Arian—and on what authority ? Verily, the authority of that most ancient work, the *Eclectic Review*. But even the *Eclectic* does not say what the Pilgrim affirms ; it says no more than that Newton was angry with Whiston for several years for having said he was an Arian. As to all the mighty deductions that the Pilgrim makes from this, we have little anxiety. Let them stand for what they are worth ; they will pass current nowhere but with those who have neither eyes nor ears to detect their spuriousness. As little do we think of the Pilgrim’s essay to deduce Newton’s orthodoxy from his published works. One thing the extracts do prove, that the maker of them had a large reliance on the easy credulity of his readers ; else could he ever have ventured to bring this and two other passages no more to the purpose, in order to realize his magnificent promise—to “produce several passages from the writings of Newton, which plainly indicate his Trinitarian sentiments” ?

“In the Eastern nations, and for a long time in the Western, the faith subsisted without this text (1 John v. 7), and it is rather a danger to religion than an advantage to make it now lean on a bruised reed.”

How does the Pilgrim make this quotation serve his purpose ? Let the reader try his skill in the art of divination ; and if he succeeds in making out any thing like a satisfactory case, he will have this reward—to know that he is a person of great penetration and extraordinary ingenuity, and may take courage from his success to try his hand at the perpetual motion or the philosopher’s stone.

Let, then, our readers sum up the evidence now brought forward,—the testimony of biographers and historians, the evidence of omission in the circumstances of the case, the positive implications furnished by Newton’s published works, the strong suspicion of evidence suppressed “unfit for publication,” the explicit declarations of two contemporaries, and both intimate acquaintances, of an anonymous yet respectable pamphleteer, and say, if we are not warranted in the conclusion, that Sir Isaac Newton was an Antitrinitarian. Had he explicitly avowed himself and suffered persecution for that avowal, we should have honoured his memory more highly than we do ; but leaving him to his Master, we shall do well to take care that, in these “*piping days of peace*,” as regards religious persecution, we do not compromise the truth by wicked concealment, or barter it for the world’s smile. And well will it be for us if we imitate the great Philosopher’s diligence in the study of the Scriptures, and follow him in his piety, gentleness, and benignity, so far as he was a follower of Christ. For, at the utmost, the time cannot be far distant when all diversities of mere earthly knowledge will have passed away ; but charity “*abideth for ever*.”

DR. J. P. SMITH'S SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH.

(Continued from p. 113.)

Section xiv. Psalm xlv. 2—8. The important words are in ver. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!"

The Psalm is considered as a prophetic address to the Messiah, who is therefore here called God, and the use made of the words in Hebrews i. 8, "But to the Son (he saith), Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," is regarded as establishing beyond all doubt the validity of this application. Some Unitarian expositors, as Mr. Belsham, adopt the translation, "God is thy throne," the support of thy throne, i. e. he will make thy dominion mighty and durable, which both the Hebrew of the Psalm and the Greek of the quotation in the Epistle will equally well bear, and which suits the connexion in both places: others suppose the word God to be here employed in an inferior sense. The prevailing and most probable opinion is, that the 45th Psalm was written on occasion of the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of the King of Egypt, and this opinion, as to its *primary* sense, is held by most of those who consider it as having a *secondary* reference to the Messiah and his kingdom, that is, by the great majority of Christian commentators. Some interpreters, indeed, of great learning, and whose opinions deserve much respect, have affirmed that the Psalm must be considered as primarily addressed to the Messiah, and is not properly applicable to Solomon or to any other person; but their chief arguments are drawn from the quotation in Heb. i. 8, (of which we shall speak presently,) and from the assumption of the point in dispute, that ver. 6 is an address to some individual as the Supreme God, whilst their application of other parts of the Psalm is figurative almost throughout, and in some instances extremely forced. The 9th and following verses may be explained *secondarily* of the church as the bride of the Messiah, but their direct and sole application in that sense is what the sober judgment of no unprejudiced reader can admit. The argument from the everlasting duration ascribed to the kingdom of the person addressed is of no weight, being a common oriental idiom: thus, for example, in Nathan's prophecy to David respecting Solomon, 1 Chron. xvii. 11—14: "I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will stablish his kingdom. He shall build me an house, (plainly shewing that Solomon is the person spoken of,) and *I will stablish his throne FOR EVER*. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; and I will not take my mercy away from him, as I took it from him that was before thee: but I will settle him in mine house and in my kingdom *for ever*; and *his throne shall be established for evermore*." It is universally acknowledged that this magnificent, prophetic language was intended, and, according to the notions of the age and country, was well adapted, to express the promise of a long reign to Solomon, and of posterity to succeed him on his throne, but nothing more; and we cannot but consider it as going far to justify the sense, "God is thy throne, for ever and ever," in the passage under our consideration, by shewing how peculiarly God had promised to establish and support the throne of the prince to whom that passage, beyond all reasonable doubt, immediately referred; but supposing the common translation to be preferable, the use of the word *God*, in an inferior sense, is not unknown to Scripture, nor at variance with oriental idiom. It must be understood to mean (as Bishop Young has translated it) *prince*, and it is certain

that what could with propriety be addressed to Solomon, could not be unsuitable to his great descendant, and could not possibly imply any thing inconsistent with the unrivalled *deity* and perfect *unity* of the Supreme Being; indeed, any such abuse of the words is guarded against by the language of ver. 7: "Therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows*," words which, if they have any meaning at all, ascribed to the person addressed *inferiority*, *derived and dependent authority*, and *equality of rank* with some *human beings*.

Referring to Mr. Belsham's statement, "It is well known that the words of the original will equally well bear to be translated *God is thy throne*"—a statement which, after due deliberation, we have ventured to adopt in the preceding remarks, Dr. S. says, "It is not quite consistent with fairness in argument, for the learned writer roundly to assert as *well known*, what he could not but know to be extremely disputable, and to have been in fact generally objected to." There is nothing so plain that it may not be disputed, and Mr. B. did not say or mean that nobody had denied what he asserted, but he certainly neither did think, nor ought in reason to have thought, it *extremely disputable*. He was safe in his assertion, 1st, because he was directly supported by the authority of Enjedenus and Crellius, Grotius,* Dr. Samuel Clarke, Pierce, Sykes, J. G. Rosenmüller, and Wakefield, not now to mention others, men certainly as competent to judge, and as little under the influence of prejudice, as any who have given an opinion on the subject; and 2dly, because, whilst the majority of commentators, adopting, in conformity with their own doctrinal views, the common construction, pass by this one without particular notice, those who have undertaken to give reasons against its grammatical propriety, have signally failed in their attempts.†

* Dr. S. remarks, that Grotius "seems anxiously to avoid giving any *construction*, contenting himself with saying, "the *sense* is." Does Dr. S. then mean to insinuate that this great critic affirmed that to be the sense of a passage of Scripture which *he knew could not be derived from the words*? Such seems to be his meaning, but such a charge neither needs nor deserves an answer. Grotius gives a reason why he thinks that the word "God" must, in this place, be understood of the Supreme Being himself, and adds, "Sensus ergo est: Deus ipse est sedes tua perpetua." He perceived no difficulty in this construction: he considered the original words as ambiguous, and not seeing reason to admit that Christ could be called God in the highest and proper sense; having, besides, before observed that the Psalm primarily referred to Solomon, he thought the reason he had given for understanding the word God in its highest sense, a sufficient reason for not addressing it as a title to a created being. Dr. S. would, in like manner, detract from the value of the opinions on this point of Enjedin, Clarke, and Pierce: the former only says "the words will admit of this explication:" possunt sic commodè explicari. And this, we answer, is all that is wanted, as no one denies that they *may* be taken according to the other construction. Clarke, in a book written after his *Scripture Doctrine*, "follows the commonly-received construction;" but he does not retract his opinion that the other is perfectly allowable. Pierce only affirms, in a note, that it is *doubtful* which construction is preferable—i. e. precisely the sentiment for which he is quoted.

† The ambiguity of the Hebrew cannot be denied: the objection to rendering the Greek words, "God is thy throne," is taken from the article being found in the predicate of the proposition; but though not of common occurrence, there are exceptions to the ordinary practice in this respect, and Mr. Yates, in his *Viudication of Unitarianism*, (p. 113,) has produced an instance of a precisely similar construction, which sufficiently justifies that translation:

Psa. lxxiii. 26: Ἡ μερίς μου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Psa. xlv. 6; Heb. i. 8: Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Dr. S.'s objections to the propriety of the figure, "God is thy throne," seem to us to be either altogether unfounded, or at least greatly exaggerated. God is spoken of as a *rock*, a *tower*, a *fortress*, a *shield*, a *refuge*; and we do not find much truth in the remark, that the protection or aid implied in these terms has more dignity than that implied in calling him the throne, i. e. some emblem of dominion of a creature. If we consider that the word *throne* is not to be understood literally as a seat, but stands for the sovereign power and dignity of which it is the symbol, and compare the passage with Numb. xviii. 20, where God says to the house of Aaron, "I am *thy part* and *thy inheritance*," I will provide for thee a suitable maintenance; Psal. xvi. 5, "Jehovah is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup," he allots to me and secures to me my portion; Psal. lxxiii. 26, "*God is my portion* for ever," he will provide for me, and to him I look for comfort; we cannot but perceive that to describe God as a throne, meaning the Giver and Upholder of its glory and dominion, is not inconsistent with the poetical style of the ancient Hebrews, and by no means deserves to be spoken of as irreverent, or as indicating the want of all correct feeling.

We do not decide in favour of Mr. Belsham's interpretation; we are in much doubt on the subject, and rather incline to favour the common translation, understanding "God" in the sense of "mighty prince;" but we have no doubt of the original words fully admitting the sense ascribed to them by Mr. B. and so many distinguished interpreters of Scripture: we think there is good reason for the inquiring mind to pause and hesitate between two highly probable explanations, and it only appears to us *certain* that the Psalm must have been originally an epithalamium addressed to some prince, (who is determined, with great probability, to have been Solomon,) and consequently that the words under consideration could not possibly have been designed to ascribe deity to the person addressed.

We proceed to consider the true character and intent of the quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and our remarks will extend to the two passages which form the subjects of Dr. S.'s fifteenth and seventeenth sections, which are applied to the Messiah solely on the authority of the author of the Epistle.

Whoever was its author, which must probably always remain a matter of extreme uncertainty, there can be no doubt that this Epistle was written by a sincere and pious Christian before the destruction of Jerusalem; and from the general diffusion of miraculous gifts in that first period of the church, and his having been a person of sufficient importance to offer advice to others, we see no reason to doubt that he was one who had experienced personal divine communications, or displayed supernatural powers. What he wrote, then, cannot but be read by us with interest and respect, as being sure to contain just views of Christian doctrine, and valuable instructions which we may all apply to our own improvement. But we know not upon what authority any one can affirm that he made, or was entitled to make, any pretensions to divine guidance *as a writer*, and we think there is scarcely any portion of the sacred volume which requires to be read with more caution, lest we should pervert the meaning of the author through ignorance of the circumstances under which he wrote, and the customs or opinions of the age, and of the people whom he addressed. We are not bound always to assume, nor can we in all cases consistently with our own reason and knowledge admit, the soundness of the *arguments* employed even by writers to whose authority, as religious instructors, we implicitly defer, and this dis-

tion has been often pointed out by learned and judicious divines. Thus Bishop Burnet :

"When divine writers argue upon any point, we are always bound to believe the conclusions that their reasonings end in, as parts of divine revelation; but we are not bound to be able to make out, or even to assent to, all the premises made use of by them in their whole extent; unless it appears plainly that they affirm the premises expressly as they do the conclusions proved by them."

And Paley,

"In reading the apostolic writings we should carefully distinguish between their *doctrines* and their *arguments*. Their doctrines came to them by revelation, properly so called; yet in propounding these doctrines in their writings or discourses, they were wont to illustrate, support, and enforce them by such analogies, arguments, and considerations, as their own thoughts suggested."

Again,

"St. Paul, I am apt to believe, has been sometimes accused of inconclusive reasoning, by our mistaking that for reasoning which was only intended for illustration. He is not to be read as a man whose own persuasion of the truth of what he taught always or solely depended on the views under which he represents it in his writings. Taking for granted the certainty of his doctrine as resting upon the revelation that had been imparted to him, he exhibits it *frequently* to the conceptions of his readers under images and *allegories*, in which if an *analogy* may be perceived, or even sometimes a *poetic resemblance* be found, it is all, perhaps, that is required."

Now, there is no part of the New Testament where considerations such as these are so much required as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and there is no subject which demands more caution and care, if we wish not to be greatly misled, and to pervert the authorities to which we appeal, than the use made of passages from the Old Testament. The Jews, in our Lord's time, considered the greatest part of their Scriptures as applicable in a secondary and mystical sense to their expected Messiah. The Christian writers often argued with them from their own concessions, or illustrated and recommended what they taught by expressing it in the words of the Old Testament. The Epistle to the Hebrews is altogether an attempt to render the gospel interesting to Jews by an application to its truths (much in the manner of the applications of Scripture which are now so common among most sects) of the words of the ancient sacred books, and by finding analogies between them and the principles or ceremonies of the law.

In this light it has been considered by some of the most distinguished theologians, and thus only it appears to us that we can obtain an intelligible and rational view of its character and purpose.

"Long before our Saviour's time," says Dr. Hey, late Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, "it seems probable that the Jews had some sort of traditions; traditional narratives, prophecies, or modes of interpreting prophecies; modes of arranging, construing, and applying the Psalms, and other parts of Holy Writ; methods of *allegorizing*; all these our Saviour and his apostles seem to have so far *adopted* as to *make use of* them in reasoning with the Jews."

Le Clerc, in his edition of Hammond's Paraphrase and Notes, says, (Heb. ix. 16,)

"All the principles of Christian doctrine which the author of this Epistle

defends, are most true, and may be proved from other parts of Scripture; but the method by which he illustrates them, is manifestly conformed to the custom of those times, as we see it in Philo, whose works abound in this sort of accommodations of passages of Scripture, and in reasonings derived from them, in which there is no regard paid to the grammatical sense, nor is any thing else attended to but the truth of the principle thus illustrated."

This passage is quoted with approbation by Rosenmüller; the same principle is defended by Sykes; and Paley's opinion may be gathered from what he says of the epistle of Barnabas:

"It is in its subject, and general composition, *much like the Epistle to the Hebrews; an allegorical application* of divers passages of the Jewish history, of their law and ritual, to those parts of the Christian dispensation *in which the author perceived a resemblance.*"—(Evidences of Christianity, B. iii. Ch. v.)

But although we do not admit the Epistle to the Hebrews as an authority with respect to the original sense or prophetic character of the portions of ancient Scripture which it quotes, it should still, according to the principles we have laid down, be authoritative in favour of the Christian doctrines which *by means of these quotations* it conveys, and if it applies unreservedly to Christ the names God and Lord, (representing *Jehovah*,) there is at least the testimony of the Christian writer, if not of the passages from the Old Testament, to the deity of our Saviour. This is readily granted: but the very means which the writer employed to attract and conciliate those whom he immediately addressed have thrown such obscurity over his style that, perhaps unavoidably, we, in these distant times, are influenced in our mode of understanding him by the opinions we have formed on the great subjects of Christian doctrine from the study of other parts of Scripture. We have endeavoured to the utmost of our power to divest ourselves of prejudice, and to consider what is the most natural, consistent, and suitable sense: we are ourselves well satisfied that we have chosen the right interpretation, but we have little hope of convincing those who come to the subject impressed with a firm belief of doctrines which we do not find in Scripture, but which the ambiguity of some of the language here employed may naturally enough seem to them to favour.

The first proposition of the writer seems to be the superiority of Christ's office to that of all previous messengers of God's will to his creatures, which he illustrates by fanciful applications of passages from the Old Testament, availing himself for this purpose of the double meaning of the word "*angel*," sometimes applied to *human*, sometimes to spiritual messengers; sometimes to the elements executing the purposes of the Almighty; sometimes to an order of superior intelligences ever ready to fulfil his commands. We shall give what we apprehend to be the sense of the passage (ch i. 4–14) which contains the quotations now under our consideration. "Being made so much better than those messengers," (the prophets by whom God had previously spoken,) "inasmuch as he hath by inheritance obtained" (acquired, as belonging naturally to his office) "a more excellent name than they" (they being only called messengers or servants, his superiority being marked by the name of *Son*). "For unto which of those messengers, said he, at any time, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?' And again, 'I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a Son.'"—(An appeal to the prevalent Jewish opinion that these words, taken from Ps. ii. and 2 Sam. vii. 14, were applicable in their highest sense to the Messiah, an opinion which, so far as relates to the last-mentioned passage, we can have no difficulty in pronouncing to be erroneous.) "And when he introduces again

the first-begotten into the world," (a reference to the resurrection,) "he saith, 'Let all the angels of God worship him'" (rather, "do homage to him." It is somewhat doubtful whence these words are taken. Dr. S. considers them as a loose quotation from Ps. xcvi. 7. "The difference of the words," he says, "is immaterial to the sense, and is not greater than occurs in some instances of passages from the Old Testament introduced into the New." It is possible he may be right. The literal translation from the Hebrew in that passage is, "Worship him, all ye *Gods*;" but the LXX. render it *αγγελοι*, *angels*. It is not certain whether the original here intends by "Gods," *princes, magistrates, or prophets*; but there is little reason to suppose that it can mean *angels* in our sense of that word. Whoever they are, it is clear that they are called upon to praise Jehovah, and there is no pretence for supposing any reference of the Psalm to the Messiah; nor will the opinion of certain Jews, at a period when they were disposed to refer every thing in their Scriptures to this expected prince, and which applies equally to all the neighbouring Psalms, be thought of much importance. Our author's attempt to explain the *introduction* of the *first-begotten into the world*, as implied in the Psalm, is, we should think, too far-fetched and fanciful to satisfy even those who are most willing to be led by him. But it is upon the whole the most probable supposition, adopted by Mr. Belsham after Sykes, that the words in the Epistle are taken from the LXX. version of Deut. xxxii. 43, where they are found exactly, though there is nothing corresponding in the purest Hebrew copies, or in the other ancient versions; and if we suppose the clause not to be genuine as a part of the passage in Deuteronomy, that is no reason why it may not have been quoted and applied by the author of the epistle, finding it, as we have no reason to doubt that he did, in his Greek copy, from whence he has drawn all his quotations.* Mr. Belsham agrees with Dr. Sykes in supposing that the *homage from all the messengers of God*, is, in the passage of Deut., required to be paid to the *chosen people*, whose father God is called in this very chapter, and who are elsewhere in the book of Exodus collectively spoken of as God's *first-born son*; that the *introducing again into the world* is the restoration of their prosperity after their afflictions, which is the subject of this part of the Song of Moses, and that the application of the words to the resurrection of Christ is an accommodation. Our doubt is, whether the writer of the epistle makes any reference at all to the original connexion of the words he quotes. He may mean merely, that by the resurrection of Christ he was so gloriously exalted, that those words of Scripture might well be applied to him, "Let all the messengers of God do homage to him." When he introduceth again the first-begotten (from the dead) into the world, he saith, the Scripture saith, i. e. we may apply the words of Scripture, "Let all the messengers of God do homage to him"). "And concerning these messengers *the Scripture* saith, 'Who maketh his messengers winds, and his ministers a flame of fire.' " (It represents them as mere servants fulfilling his commands, like the winds

* Dr. Smith thinks "its variations in the different MSS. of the LXX. itself afford a presumption against its genuineness" (i. e. as a part of the original LXX.). May it not be more justly said, looking at Dr. S.'s own comparison of the present Hebrew with the Aldine, Vatican, and Alexandrine editions of the LXX., that the parallelism between the two first sentences, one of which is retained in the Hebrew, the other in the Aldine Greek, is favourable to the genuineness of both, the same sort of parallelism being found in the following clauses, and that the difference between the Vatican and Alexandrine—"be strong in him"—"strengthen them," proves the existence of an original in another language, of which both these are translations?

and the lightning. The quotation is from the LXX. version of the 104th Ps. The proper translation of the Hebrew seems to be, "who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire, i. e. lightnings, his servants." The author of the epistle means no more than that the condition of previous messengers, as compared with that of the Son, might be expressed in these words of Scripture.) "But concerning the Son it saith, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' " &c., (whichever construction of the words we adopt, the person referred to is spoken of as of exalted rank, and as distinguished by the favour of his God, treated not as a servant, but with distinguished honour, the passage being reputed among the Jews as a prophecy of the Messiah, and capable of being really so understood, though originally applied to Solomon, was the more to the writer's purpose,) "and 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundations of the earth,' " &c. (The 102nd Ps., from which this passage is taken, cannot, without extreme violence, be considered as applicable to Christ, and no authority possessed by the writer of this epistle could cause those who are not blinded by prejudice to understand it so. Some have supposed the words to be by accommodation employed to express, still more strongly than the preceding quotation had done, the permanence and glory of Christ's kingdom, and to ascribe to him a new and moral creation; but this is forced; and besides it is very unlikely, as Mr. Belsham justly observes, that any writer, addressing himself to Jews, should "presume to hold that language concerning a prophet, however dignified, which, in their sacred writings, was uniformly appropriated to the Deity." Much more probable is the interpretation of Emlyn and others, that "the immutability of God is here declared as a pledge of the immutability of the kingdom of Christ." "The God last mentioned," says Emlyn, "was Christ's God, who had anointed him; and the *author* thereupon, addressing himself to this God, breaks out into the celebration of his *power*, and especially his *unchangeable duration*; which he dwells upon as what he principally cites the text for; in order, I conceive, to prove the stability of the Son's kingdom before spoken of."—Emlyn's Works, Vol. II. p. 340. This deserves attention, but we are disposed to think that this passage should rather be connected with what follows than with what precedes it. The writer quotes a remarkable declaration of the power, majesty, and immutability of God, and then argues in confirmation of what he had before said, that this great Being condescended to place the Son at his right hand, to exalt him and cause him to triumph, whilst other messengers were but ministers of his will for the service of those who were "to become heirs of salvation,"—to be admitted to enjoy the blessings of the Gospel.) "But to which of those messengers, said he, at any time, 'Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool'?" (Applying a clause from the 2nd Ps., which, though originally relating to David, was believed to have a secondary application to the Messiah.) "Are not they all ministering spirits" (probably *ministering winds*—servants swift as winds, in allusion to ver. 7) "sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"

We have given what we consider as the most consistent and satisfactory interpretation of the passage: respecting the author's mode of quoting and applying texts from the Old Testament, we feel no hesitation. With somewhat less confidence, though upon the whole with a feeling that the evidence for it decidedly preponderates, we follow Wakefield, Simson, and Belsham, in explaining "angels" as here meaning the ancient prophets. Dr. S.'s objection to this, from the change in the sense of the word in ch. ii. 5, we do not think of much weight as regards such a writer as the author of this epis-

tle; but the comparison of Heb. ii. 2 with Gal. iii. 19 and (which reference he omits) Acts vii. 53, if those passages are to be understood according to the general opinion of commentators, apparently supported by Jewish traditions, is much more to the purpose; and as we have doubts on the subject, we request our readers to observe, that admitting, throughout, the translation "angels," and understanding the passage to affirm the superiority of Christ to spiritual beings employed in accomplishing the Divine purposes under the former dispensations, it is still the superiority of Christ's *office*, and the dignity to which God *has exalted him*, which are spoken of, and no inference can be thence fairly drawn respecting his nature.

Undoubtedly, if the New Testament distinctly teaches the Deity of Christ, the allusions of the writer to the Hebrews will be understood as confirming that doctrine. But the present question is, whether the doctrine is taught in the Old Testament, and what we hope we have proved is, that the passages treated of in Dr. S.'s xivth, xvth, and xviith sections, neither in themselves appear to teach it, nor are proved to contain it by the use made of them in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The xviith section is on Ps. cx., usually regarded as prophetic of the Messiah, and quoted by our Lord himself, to confound the Jews by the acknowledgment here made by David of his superiority. We cannot, however, perceive that this Psalm contains any thing which exalts the Messiah in any other sense than as all Christians believe that he is exalted. That, although the descendant of David, he was much greater than David, and might properly in prophetic vision be called by him Lord, and be represented as *his superior, his sovereign*, is universally acknowledged. Even the Jews would not have denied this. But the difficulty proposed was, how could David address, as his Lord, one not then existing, his own descendant in distant times? The Jews had no answer ready; the Orthodox now answer, because Christ, being God, then existed in heaven, as was well known to David. In opposition to them is Mr. Belsham's judicious note: "The proper answer seems to be, that the Psalmist was transported in vision to the age of the Messiah, and speaks as though he were contemporary with Christ. This mode of writing was not unusual with the prophets." The Calm Inquirer's note does not then "proceed on a wrong assumption of the point under consideration," but is a solid answer to the argument usually drawn from our Lord's question in favour of his superiority of nature, and we do not see that Dr. Smith has made the case any stronger. The priesthood, according to the order of Melchisedek, of course refers to the office and work, not to the nature of the Messiah, and as explained by the writer to the Hebrews, implies nothing which Unitarians do not fully believe. It only remains for us to notice Dr. Smith's gloss on the fifth verse of the Psalm:

"The Lord (Adonai, which he afterwards observes is 'the name appropriated to the living and true God') is on thy right hand: (the address is now turned to Jehovah :) He smiteth kings in the day of his wrath," &c.

He would have us understand, that "the Lord" here is the same person spoken of by the Psalmist as "my Lord" in ver. 1st, and that he is here distinguished by a name peculiarly appropriated to the Supreme God. The reason, we presume, for this construction is, that "the Lord" is here said to be "on the right hand;" whereas in the first verse we find "Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand." "The Lord," therefore, in the second place, must signify the same person who was before placed at God's right hand, and the words addressed to Jehovah who called him there.

In opposition to this we observe, that as the whole of the rest of the Psalm (and manifestly both the preceding and following clauses) is addressed to the great personage who is its subject, it is most unreasonable and unnatural to suppose these few words to be differently addressed, and there is no occasion, as we have elsewhere the very expression here employed of GOD *being at the right hand of those whom he favoured*, and it is a different phrase from that in the first verse. Ps. xvi. 8: "Because he (Jehovah) *is at my right hand*, I shall not be moved." Ps. cix. 31: "He (Jehovah) shall *stand at the right hand* of the poor, to save him from those that condemn his soul." It is then evident, that ver. 5 is not addressed to Jehovah, but speaks of him as supporting that great personage whose exaltation had been described; and to put this beyond doubt, the fact is, that for *Adonai*, a great many MSS. have *Jehovah*, which there is every reason to believe to be the true reading, and which is adopted by Dathe.

(To be continued.)

ON THE CHRONOLOGY AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

(Continued from p. 44.)

It was stated in p. 768 of our last volume, that "the fundamental point to be decided before attempting a chronological arrangement of the gospel narratives, is, the *duration of our Saviour's ministry*; in other words, the interval between his baptism and his crucifixion: was he crucified at the *second*, the *third*, or the *fourth*, Passover after his baptism?" In the work which has led us to enter upon the subject,* Mr. Greswell follows what appears to be the common opinion—that our Lord was crucified at the *fourth* Passover after his baptism; that his ministry lasted *three years and some months*. Mr. Benson, in his *Chronology of our Saviour's Life*,† adopts the much more reasonable hypothesis, that he was crucified at the *third* Passover; that his ministry lasted *two years and some months*.

As considerable evidence has been adduced to support the position that the early Christian writers considered the ministry of Christ as including at most *two* Passovers,‡ Mr. Benson has found it necessary to examine this evidence; and though his remarks are not always satisfactory, yet, on the whole, we are disposed with him to lay little stress on their opinion, as such. It does not appear that they had any other evidence for it, than that which

* *Dissertations upon the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels.* By the Rev. Edward Greswell, M. A. In 3 Vols. 8vo. 1830.

† Chap. vii. § 1. From some obscurity in the mode of citation in our first article on this subject, (p. 764 near the bottom,) we may have appeared to speak of Mr. Greswell, instead of Mr. Benson, as a "judicious critic." Of the former, we have sufficiently spoken; to the latter, even where we differ from his conclusions, we deem the epithet justly due for the character of his investigations.

‡ Of the *True Years of the Birth and of the Death of Christ: Two Chronological Dissertations.* 1733. (By Nic. Mann.) Dr. Priestley's *Critical Dissertations* prefixed to his *Harmony*, Section vi., and his *Second Letter to the Bishop of Waterford* (Dr. Newcome, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh), on the *Duration of our Saviour's Ministry*: 1780. (*Works*, Vol. XX. pp. 47—51, and pp. 138—147.) See also Marsh's *Notes on Michaelis*, in Vol. III. Part II. p. 62.

we ourselves possess in the gospels, and of this they do not seem to have made any consistent use.

"In matters of chronology," says Mr. Benson, "their errors are so remarkable, that I should feel almost inclined to follow the course pursued by Sir Isaac Newton upon the present question, and, rejecting their irreconcilable testimonies altogether, attempt to explore a path for myself, without any regard to the statements which they have made, were it not that such a proceeding might be construed into a confession of weakness, and want of dependence upon the truth of the hypothesis which I defend."

We are under no such restriction; and we proceed to consider, as the essential point, what information we derive from the gospels themselves.

It is desirable to bear in mind that there were three national festivals instituted by Moses, at which every adult Jew was under a general obligation to attend:—the *Passover*, near the close of March, or in the former part of April; the *Pentecost*, seven weeks after the Passover; and the *Feast of Tabernacles*, towards the end of September. There was another considerable festival, called the *Feast of Dedication*, which was celebrated about the beginning of December (in commemoration of the purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabæus); but this was not instituted by Moses, and attendance upon it was not *obligatory* upon any one.

If our Lord's ministry lasted above *three* years, it included four Passovers; and the Pentecost and the Tabernacles each occurred three times: and besides these *ten* national festivals, the Feast of Dedication occurred three times. If it lasted only *one* year and a few months, then the following festivals occurred in it—the Passover, the Pentecost, the Tabernacles, the Dedication, and a second Passover. A slight acquaintance with the gospel history will satisfy the mind, (if not prepossessed with any hypothesis on the subject,) that it affords no countenance to the larger number of festivals; for we are not informed that our Lord was present at more than four national festivals; and even supposing that the Passover spoken of in John vi. 4, was not the *last* Passover, still there are *five national festivals* which are in no way ever *noticed* in the gospels. This objection obviously rests much less upon the hypothesis that the ministry of Christ included only *three* Passovers and two of each of the other festivals.

On examining the Gospel of Matthew and that of Mark, we find mention of one Passover only—that at which our Lord was crucified: and from these gospels alone we should be unable to say that his ministry lasted even a year.

The Gospel of Luke gives no further information respecting the duration of Christ's ministry;* but he specifies the period of the *commencement* of John's preaching, viz. the 15th year of Tiberius, in which year the two

* The event recorded in Luke vi. 1—5, (and also by St. Matthew and St. Mark,) must have occurred not long after a Passover; and the expression *εν σαββατω δευτεροπρωτω*—the *second-first sabbath*—however this may be understood, shews that it was at an early period of the Jewish year, which commenced somewhere between the former part of March and the former part of April: but this does not prove that a Passover intervened between our Lord's baptism and the commencement of his public preaching in Galilee. Independently of St. John's Gospel, there is no sufficient evidence of more than *one* Passover between his baptism and his crucifixion; and those who dwelt principally on St. Luke's narrative, might easily form the opinion that John's ministry began in the same year with the death of Christ.

Gemini were consuls.* It is a curious fact, that some of the early Christian writers speak of the *death* of Christ as occurring in that year; and though it shews how little we can rely on their chronology, it also proves that they could not have entertained the opinion now prevalent as to the interval between our Lord's baptism and his death.†

In St. John's Gospel we find mentioned a *Passover*, ch. ii. 13; a festival which *may* have been the succeeding *Pentecost*, ch. v. 1; a *Passover* approaching, ch. vi. 4; a *Feast of Tabernacles*, ch. vii. 2; a *Feast of Dedication*, ch. x. 22; and the last *Passover*, ch. xi. 55. If this were the exact chronological order, then the Passover spoken of in John vi. 4, as approaching, could not have been the *last* Passover: and several able writers have been led, by this consideration, to extend the duration of our Lord's ministry to two years and some months, so as to include *three* Passovers.‡ Supposing this correct, we have still three national festivals, during which we have no proof that our Lord was at Jerusalem. This fact presents some difficulty; but the chief objection to the hypothesis arises from the situation, in Matthew's Gospel, of the miracle recorded in John vi.: and this objection presses against every hypothesis except that which supposes the Passover, near which the miracle occurred, to have been the last in our Lord's ministry.

The portion of St. Matthew's Gospel which begins at ch. xiv. 13, and ends with ch. xx. 34, contains a regular, uninterrupted narrative of our Lord's transactions, apparently a short time before his sufferings at Jerusalem. This portion begins with the miracle of the Five Thousand; and, from Matthew alone, we might reasonably infer, that the miracle was performed a short time before the Passover at which our Lord suffered. A month is sufficient for all the events which are recorded by him between that miracle and the crucifixion.—Now St. John says (ch. vi. 4), that the Passover was *nigh* at the period of this miracle; and this agrees precisely with the narrative of St. Matthew.

The succession of events as recorded by Mark, agrees, in this portion of the history, with that of Matthew; and as their order materially differs in the preceding periods, their agreement in this is the more important.§ The period shortly preceding our Lord's crucifixion is that in which, *a priori*, we might expect the greatest agreement in the order of events. Every thing must then have had a constantly increasing and intense interest, and the records would naturally be most in the order of occurrence.

The corresponding part of Luke's Gospel begins with ch. ix. 10, and extends to ch. xix. 29; but this includes a remarkable portion which will hereafter be analyzed, consisting of a collection of precepts, parables, and

* Augustus died Aug. 19, A. D. 14. The 15th year of Tiberius, therefore, began Aug. 19, A. D. 29. In the year 29, the two Gemini were Consuls; and though they were succeeded, on the 1st of July, by Pomponius Secundus and Sanguinius Maximus, yet the Julian year in which the 15th of Tiberius began, received its designation, of course, from the Gemini. The 15th of Tiberius is the only Roman date that appears in the gospels.

† How far the hypothesis entertained by various eminent men, that the commencement of Tiberius's reign is to be reckoned from his proconsular government, is in itself well-founded, and agreeable to the chronology of the early fathers, will be considered in a subsequent article.

‡ Dr. Lardner, Dr. Benson, Mr. Cappe, and Mr. Benson, advance this opinion.

§ The portion of Christ's ministry beginning with the miracle of the Five Thousand, and ending with his last visit to Jerusalem, includes from ch. vi. 30, to the end of the xth chapter of Mark's Gospel.

discourses, with such facts only as gave rise to them.* Leaving this out of the question, the order of St. Luke, in the period referred to, is the same with that of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

If the order of St. John be regarded as strictly chronological, our Lord must have been *present* at two festivals (besides a Passover and a Pentecost of which we have no account) between the miracle of the Five Thousand and the last Passover, viz. the Feast of Tabernacles, and the Feast of Dedication. Now, the former of these, all the apostles must have attended; and yet there is no intimation of this in the Gospel of Matthew; nor can we find any interval, after the 14th chapter, in which the transactions of above a year could have occurred.

If the order of St. John be not regarded as strictly chronological, no essential difficulty occurs from the position in his Gospel of the miraculous feeding of the Five Thousand. Now, his Gospel consists of several *independent* portions, (principally supplementary to the other gospels,) each complete and regular in itself, and each containing some intimation of the period to which it belongs.† We have no evidence, or internal reason to believe, that he *intended* to arrange those separate portions in a chronological order: and to suppose this, reduces us to the necessity of admitting that he has passed by at least *one* Passover, as well as several other national festivals, without any notice whatever of the transactions which occurred at them.

It is attended with much less difficulty to admit, that the separate portions of St. John's Gospel are not exactly in chronological order, than that the

* See Marsh's Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our three first Canonical Gospels, p. 202. Without adopting all Bishop Marsh's views in that acute investigation, or even maintaining that a *separate* collection of this nature existed before the time of Luke, we have no hesitation in the belief that the middle portion of the Gospel (ch. x. 51 to xviii. 14, as Marsh thinks) consists of such *Memorabilia*; and that St. Luke placed it in the interval between our Lord's leaving Galilee and his entering Judea, (after passing through the Peræa,) as being the most convenient situation for a miscellaneous collection, the exact date of which he might be unable to ascertain. It is further probable, that he was led to this position by many of the discourses having been delivered in the Peræa—some of them on the last journey; and it is not improbable that he collected them there while engaged in preparing materials for his invaluable narrative.

† This subject will be considered more fully hereafter; but it is proper to state here, that the Gospel of St. John consists of the following distinct parts; and these may, not improbably, have first existed as *separate* supplementary narratives.

i. Transactions succeeding our Lord's return from the Desert, till soon after the *first Passover*; which (including the Introduction) occupy the first four chapters.

ii. Transactions at another festival of the Jews, probably the *Pentecost*; recorded in the vth chapter.

iii. The miracle of the Five Thousand, and Christ's subsequent discourse at Capernaum, not long before a Passover, (which, following the evidence of the other gospels, we say was *the last Passover*;) both recorded in the viith chapter, with which we unite the 1st verse of the viiith.

iv. Transactions at, and immediately succeeding, the *Feast of Tabernacles*; occupying from ch. vii. 2, to ch. x. 21, with which, undoubtedly, the xth chapter should have closed.

v. Transactions at, and soon after, the *Feast of Dedication*; from ch. x. 22, to ch. xi. 54, with which the xith chapter should have closed.

vi. Transactions during our Lord's last visit to Jerusalem, at the *Passover*; recorded in ch. xi. 55, to the end of ch. xx.

vii. A supplementary record, in ch. xxi., closed by the declaration of the person—say one of the Ephesian Elders—who edited the Gospel, and possibly arranged the separate documents.

regular connected narrative in the ninth and six following chapters of Matthew had such interruptions, and such long intervals in it, as there must have been if the miracle of the Five Thousand occurred above a year before the crucifixion,—and also that the Gospel of St. John is so defective as it must then have been, in the account of what took place at the Jewish Festivals.

To reconcile the Gospel of St. John with the ancient opinion respecting the duration of our Lord's ministry, Dr. Priestley and others have supposed, that the word *Passover*, in John vi. 4, was not in the earliest copies. But this supposition is not authorized by any external evidence whatever; and it is not necessary for the object in view.*

If the opinion of the early fathers respecting the duration of our Lord's ministry, had been, decidedly, that it included three, or four, Passovers, and if, further, they had rested it on the tradition supposed to have begun with those who were personally acquainted with the period recorded by the evangelists, then it ought to have been allowed great weight, and could have been overbalanced only by clear internal evidence to the contrary: indeed, if, on such grounds, they had extended the ministry of Christ to include *three* Passovers, and supposed the festival mentioned in the fifth chapter of John to have been one of them, there is no internal evidence which would have weighed so powerfully against their opinion as to produce any great hesitation in admitting it. In the actual circumstances of the case, though their opinion (taken generally) accords with our own, we cannot lay any great stress upon it: but were it as consistent and clear, and its foundation as complete, as Mr. Mann and Dr. Priestley regard it, in favour of two Passovers only, yet sound principles of criticism as to the *text* of Scripture would make me hesitate in giving up the word *πασχα*, or the whole verse, in opposition to the evidence of every known manuscript and version. Bishop Pearce rested on internal evidence in proposing to relinquish the whole verse; and his note deserves the reader's attention. It is a specimen of the latitude with which critical emendation was, at that period, pursued, even by learned divines of the Church of England; and it ought to rescue Dr. Priestley from the imputations so often cast on his mode of criticism. Bishop Pearce's reasoning proceeds upon the supposition, that the separate portions of St. John's Gospel are arranged in the exact order of time; and if this were true, his argument would have great weight. On Dr. Priestley's opinion as to the duration of Christ's ministry, the alteration of the text required, for its availableness, a transposition of one of the portions of John's Gospel; and one similar transposition is all that is needed to bring the order to that of the preceding gospels, without any change in the text.

Against every supposition some objection rests; but the reference of the miracle of the Five Thousand to a time shortly preceding the *last* Passover, is so perfectly accordant with the narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, that the difficulty arising from the position of it in St. John's Gospel is entirely outweighed. The difficulty, too, is itself greatly lessened by the characteristics of that Gospel. We know of no other. In every other respect it obviously accords with the circumstances of the period. Our Lord's discourse after the miracle, as recorded by St. John, (see vers. 51—56,) has

* Independently of this objection, (which we deem an insuperable one,) Dr. Priestley's arrangement of the events in our Lord's ministry is attended, as we shall hereafter shew, with other great difficulties; and, in particular, it leaves the *last* five months with few records.

that species of reference to his death, which implies its near approach. The Evangelist himself says, (ver. 64,) that he knew from the beginning who was going to betray him; ὁ παραδωσων αυτον: and at the close of the chapter he says of Judas Iscariot, "for he was about to betray him," οὗτος γαρ ημελλεν αυτον παραδιδοναι. Then again, it is obvious from each of the prior gospels, that this miracle occurred not long before the Transfiguration; and during this, as St. Luke records (ch. ix. 31), the two heaven-sent messengers spake to Christ of his departure, which he was about to fulfil, ἣν εμελλε πληρουν, at Jerusalem. It seems impossible, indeed, from ch. ix. 7—56, that Luke could have had any other idea of the period of the miracle of the Five Thousand, than that it occurred shortly before our Lord's final visit to Jerusalem at the last Passover.

We know of no writer that has come to our conclusion as to the period of this miracle, except G. J. Vossius, in his work *De Annis Christi*; and he is commonly, through some oversight, adduced to support the emendation of the text in John vi. 4. Perceiving from a note in Newcome's first Letter to Priestley, (pp. 117—119,) that he entertained the simple and obvious, but neglected, opinion which we advocate, we requested a friend on whose accuracy and acquaintance with the subject we could rely, to examine Gehrard Vossius's work, and ascertain the grounds on which he rested his opinion. The views of this eminent critic are so exactly accordant with our own, that we have great satisfaction in laying before the reader the information with which we have been furnished.

Vossius gives his opinion, in p. 49, that Christ was crucified a year and a few months after his baptism; but adds, that the words of John (in ch. vi. 4) appear decidedly to oppose it. This objection he obviates by observing (1) that if the Evangelist had referred to an intervening Passover, he would not have merely spoken of such a Passover as *approaching*, but would have given some account of the *transactions* during it: (2,) that instances of departure from the order of time, frequently occur in the gospels: and, (3,) that Luke obviously considered the miracle in question as occurring shortly before the time when Christ was to be crucified. He maintains, therefore, that we have no need to resort to the omission of the word *πασχα*.

We have now considered the first of the points we had in view; and as the internal evidence is most decidedly in favour of the opinion that the ministry of Christ included only two Passovers, and this is accordant with the prevalent opinion of the Christian fathers during the two centuries succeeding that period, we entertain it, as we have long done, without hesitation, and make it the foundation of our arrangement of the gospel narratives.

The other subjects we have to consider, are,

(1.) The peculiar texture of each Gospel, so far as respects the succession of events; in order to determine which we should make our guide in the chronological arrangement of the evangelical records. And

(2.) The date of our Lord's baptism, and that of his death; in considering which we shall have to shew what Luke probably intended by the 15th year of Tiberius. In this we shall have again to advert to the opinion of the early fathers on the duration of Christ's ministry, and may be able to give some particulars respecting their statements on the subject.

(To be continued.)

LETTERS FROM GERMANY.

(No. VIII.)

SIR,

Heidelberg.

FEW names are better known in the Gymnasia of Germany than Dinter's. His School-Bible soon came into general use, and it has maintained its ground, not indeed without opposition, but till lately without a rival. It was prepared by Dinter with a view to the use of schoolmasters in particular. He has distinguished, with certain marks, those parts of the Bible which should, and those which should not be read, in schools, according to his judgment; and has illustrated all with a special regard to what will be useful to teachers, and salutary and instructive to children. If, however, he thought himself sufficiently fortified against the attacks of church orthodoxy, by drawing his illustrations from history and criticism, and invoking the authority and example of Ernesti and his followers in defence of his manner of exposition, he was soon undeceived; the charge of Rationalism was presently reiterated against him in periodicals and pamphlets, accompanied with deep lamentations, that an instrument was now placed in the hands of teachers, through which a deadly poison could not fail to be infused into young minds. On the other side, the book was approved and defended with great resolution in the more popular reviews and journals; and its sale soon reached to several thousand copies. At the opening of the campaign, Dinter had proposed to his opponents to produce another School-Bible, and leave it to the teachers to choose between them. This has been done at length in the Evangelical School-Bible; but it has not been judged necessary to prepare it solely or particularly for the use of teachers. It is also remarked in Kohr's Preacher's Journal, that there is a mistake, or a misnomer, in the title-page of the Evangelical Bible. The authors have stated in the preface, that their illustrations are in agreement with the creeds which have been already established in their church-evangelical confessions of faith. The Reviewer says that the title should, therefore, be, not the Evangelical, but the Symbolical Bible, which imports neither more nor less than that the exposition is in conformity to a pre-established sense and rule, namely, to the particular views of the authors of the symbolical books.

In a country like Protestant Germany, where, both in and out of the schools and pulpits, inquiry refuses to be fettered by authority, and every man, who thinks at all on religious questions, exercises his own power of thought, holding himself accountable only to the judgment of God, it was to be expected that many opinions, and shades of opinion, would arise on the subject of divine revelations and inspirations. Lessing's free speculations opened the door to the public discussion of these important questions. He began by suggesting, that Christianity would exist even if the Scriptures were not extant. Walch entered into the discussion in his "Inquiry respecting the Use of the Holy Scriptures in the First Four Centuries." Lessing, in his "Education of the Human Race," and Krug, in "Letters on the Perfectibility of Revealed Religion," proposed their opinion, that a more perfect religion will exist upon earth, to which Christianity will give place, or rather, in which it will merge. This will be the religion of pure reason. On the other side appeared Meyer's Prize Essay on the question, How far have the doctrines and precepts of the New Testament a local and temporary ordination, and how far are they of universal and perpetual validity? Fichte, in 1793, published "An Attempt to establish a Critical Test of all

Revelations." These speculations did not seduce the learned from the more sober and useful investigation of facts. The genuineness of the sacred text was examined in the Introductions of Michaelis, Hug, Eichhorn, Jahn; Jerusalem's Letters on the Writings and Philosophy of Moses; Lang's Essay towards a Harmony of Sacred and Profane Writings; Semler's Investigation of the Canon; Weber's Contribution to the History of the New Testament Canon; Corrodi's Illustration of the History of the Jewish and Christian Canon; Lichtenstein's *Paralipomena Critica circa textum Veteris Testamenti*; Nosselt's Inaugural Dissertation at Halle, on the Internal Evidence, &c. &c. Different hypotheses of inspiration accompanied or followed the historical investigation. Ernesti maintained (*Neue Theol. Biblische*) that, as we cannot think clearly without words, nor impart to others a clear idea of our meaning without the use of words, the Holy Spirit gave the expression to the sacred writers. Michaelis, Dodelein, Calixtus, Morus, judged it sufficient to maintain that God aided the writers, so that they could not err. Simon and Holdenius held, that what the writers have expressly stated to have been spoken by God is inspired, and only that. Kant's opinion was, that since an inspired book must have the character of moral usefulness for all men in all times, its morality alone is divine; while others affirmed only that which is properly doctrine, to be inspired. Some thought that writings which had been at first produced without inspiration, were afterwards affirmed and warranted by inspired men; thus the historical books of the Old Testament were confirmed by Jesus Christ; the Gospels of Mark and Luke by Peter and Paul. This was Tollner's opinion, and seems to have been Doddridge's. Semler's examination of the different hypotheses produced answers in defence of the commonly-received opinion from Schmid, Mullner, Pitiscus, Tollner, and many others. Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament was followed by Letters of some learned Dutchmen, published by Le Clerc. The attempts of some Rationalists of the present century to explode rather than elucidate the facts of the Christian revelation, fall not within the history of sober criticism. Let it be shewn, if man is competent to shew it, that supernatural facts are impossible; let the evidence on which the history of a revelation rests, be severely examined; let it be proved, if the proof were possible, that it ought not to be received on the evidence of testimony, however strong and undeniable. But let not a plain and simple statement of supernatural facts be tortured and constrained into a record of what is purely natural; let not literary trifling approach any part of the foundations of the dearest hopes of man. The reasoning of Hume and his followers against the credibility of miracles attacks them in a very different way; it is sound, or it is sophistical; but it is not mere gratuitous and unsupported assertion. It must be shewn, and I apprehend it has been shewn in the judgment of the author himself, that it is not unanswerable. The author of the *Essays on Truth* seems, however, to have the fullest conviction, that to receive a history of a miraculous event on the evidence even of the strongest possible testimony, is to admit and to deny at the same time that like causes produce like effects. Faith in testimony rests upon the certainty of this law of causation. But a miracle is a departure from it; therefore to receive a miracle on the evidence of testimony is to believe that the law has been violated, on evidence which is valid, only because the law is inviolable. Hume's objection against faith in miracles has no weight unless it convicts it of this absurdity.

The certainty of causation we must assume by our rational nature; but that no event can arise from any cause whatsoever which is not within the

present experience of mankind, is no necessary assumption. The sole question is, whether a supernatural event requires that like causes should not produce like effects. Certainly, this is not supposed by the believer in a miraculous event. On the contrary, he believes in the intervention of a cause, which is not in nature, of the immediate power of God; because the event cannot be an effect of any natural cause with which he is acquainted. A case of testimony may be supposed so strong as to require this intervention either in the physical or moral world. In the former it has a worthy object, if it authenticates a divine revelation; in the latter, it is without any end worthy of the interposition. Knapp's observations on divine revelations, and the inspiration of the books of the Old and New Testament, display his usual sobriety of judgment. "Events," he says, "have often been ascribed to the immediate act of God, because the means through which they were effected were not known. Hence the ignorant and uninstructed are prone to see miracles, and to believe in them more readily than the more educated; they are less acquainted with natural causes. This has brought every history of miracles into doubt and discredit with many thinking men. But it is surely a great error, though a very common one, to draw a universal conclusion from particular facts, and to assume that because many histories of miracles have been found to be false, therefore all, however well attested, must be rejected. It cannot be said that such extraordinary effects of divine power are impossible; and they have a moral possibility: they are not contrary to the wisdom of God, whilst they serve to the accomplishment of an important end, which was not to be accomplished, or not so well, in another way. It cannot be shewn *à priori* that such events will never exist; and as little can it be demonstrated *à priori*, that they are physically or morally impossible; and this has been acknowledged by our late philosophers, as Kant and Fichte. It is, therefore, a question of fact only, and rests entirely on the credibility of the witnesses." On the inspiration of the sacred books he speaks with a discretion which is not always observed by the advocates of revelation: "The Holy Scriptures have been called the word of God, especially since the time of Hutter, who so defined them. Tollner, Semler, and others, have held that this use of the expression, the word of God, may be permitted, if it is rightly explained. In the Bible itself it is never applied to the books which compose it; but it means either prophecies and other revelations, or doctrines and religious precepts. Rom. iii. 2; Acts vii. 38. A distinction between the Holy Scriptures and the word of God is to be made, because all that is contained in the Scriptures is not the proper word of God; and since only a part of their contents is the word of God, we shall speak more truly and correctly if we use the expression only of that part and not of the whole. In Jesus Sirach, Josephus, the Talmud, and in the New Testament, the books of the Old Testament are named the law and the prophets; or the law, the prophets, and the psalms, or poetical books. They were called by the Jews generally the four-and-twenty books. A sort of sacred library or archive was formed by degrees in the temple in which the present collection of the writings of the Old Testament at length grew to what it is. The collection began with the law of Moses. Josephus mentions it in his Antiquities, (B. v. l.) *ανακειμενα εν τη ιερη γραμματα*."

I subjoin a historical sketch extracted from the section on the reading of the Holy Scriptures. "According to Cyrillus of Alexandria, Julian reproached the Christians with placing their Scriptures in the hands of children and of women, to be read by them without discrimination. The declension

of letters, in the times that followed, especially in the West, was so great that the whole learning of an ecclesiastic, in the middle ages, consisted often of nothing more than that he was able to read. Of course, the Bible was little read by the people, for most were unable to read. After the seventh century, when the Latin language had ceased to be commonly spoken in the several countries of Christendom, the reading of the Scriptures in the Latin translation was continued in the churches: the Bible and its contents came to be always less known among the laity. In the mean time, many erroneous principles and practices arose, which were contrary to the Scriptures, but conducive to the wealth and power of the pope and the clergy. Some, however, of the more discerning and better instructed part of the laity read the Scriptures, saw the still increasing departure from them, and strove against it. Now it began to be the policy of the clergy to deter the people from reading the Bible. Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) forbade it in the eleventh century. Innocent III. did the same in the beginning of the thirteenth century, when many of the people had derived juster views from the reading of the Scriptures, and placed themselves in opposition to the designs of the Papal priesthood. Hence, at the Council of Toulouse, in the year 1229, on account of the Waldenses, the use of the Bible by the laity, and especially all translations of it into their mother-tongue, were prohibited. Still the number of readers of the Bible, both within and without the Roman Catholic Church, continually increased, and they saw more plainly the abuses which had been multiplied, the degraded state of learning, and the excessive corruption of the church. At length, in the sixteenth century, Luther opened the way to the general reading of the Scriptures by his German translation, and founded his project of Reformation expressly on the restoration of the free use of the Bible. The prohibition was renewed at the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century; but Pope Pius the Fourth, in the index librorum prohibitorum, ordered that it should be subject to the discretion of bishops and confessors. It was again renewed in the seventeenth century by Clement VIII. and Gregory XV., and again in the eighteenth century by Clement XI. But the Catholic Church is wrongly accused of having received it universally. Some of its divines, especially in the Gallican Church, have always defended the lawfulness, and even the necessity, of reading the Holy Scriptures; and the doctrine of the Jansenists, and of Quesnell in particular, *Lectio Scriptorum Sacrorum est pro omnibus*, occasioned the renewal of the prohibition in the bull *Unigenitus*. Thus it has never been without limitation. Indeed, the contrary has been often maintained by eminent theologians in the Roman Church, though many Jesuits, or ex-Jesuits, have supported the prohibition. (*Vide Hegelmeier's Geschichte des Bibelverbots, Ulm, 1783.*)"

The religious world in Germany is divided into two great classes, which are separated by a plain line of distinction. All on one side deny the existence of a positive religion; these are Rationalists: all on the other side affirm it; these are Supernaturalists, including Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, Trinitarians, Unitarians, Biblical Christians, Believers in Evangelical or Symbolical Books, Pietists, and Mystics. "A positive religion," says Knapp, "is divine instruction on religious subjects, which imparts the knowledge of truths not demonstrable by reason. The doctrine that there is a God, that he is good to man, and all other truths of natural religion, are not positive: but that God has revealed himself to man in Jesus Christ, and that through him, *and for his sake*, he saves mankind, are positive. This use of the word is derived from the Greek expression *νομος τιθεσθαι*, for law

is positive; it decides without argument. The extraordinary mission of a teacher of a positive religion can be established only by extraordinary facts. Were the history of miracles in the Scriptures stript of the supernatural by a violent and arbitrary exposition, with the design to gain credit to the Bible, exactly the contrary would be accomplished, for it would thus be changed into a book full of inconsistency."

The Rationalist considers all the truths of religion not only as consonant with human reason, but as a natural revelation of God, issuing from the heart of man, and developed and constructed by the exercise of his understanding. This, he says, is the sole divine inspiration, and it bears in itself its divine authority. In one confession all on both sides are united, that the ground of religion is laid deep in the nature of man, that it is his greatest want, his highest perfection, the proper distinction of his intellectual being, the link that binds him to the moral creation, the voice of God within him, and the earnest of his immortality.

J. M.

THE DREAMER.

No. I.

Η και ονειροπολον (και γαρ τ' οναρ εκ Διου εστιν). II. α 63.

START not, gentle reader—but—but—art thou free of the corporation of shadows? Hast thou seen the things that are not? Is thy sleeping brain creative? Is thy *pia mater* prolific in slumber? To be brief, most courteous—dost thou *dream*?

Thou dost? Well, we tender thee the right hand of fellowship. Thou knowest us not—but we are the Grand Master of the Order. We were born a visionary. Our palace is an air-castle—our kingdom lieth in cloudland (disputed by that Papist pretender, S. T. Coleridge)—and our diadem, when we list to wear it, is a twisted rainbow. But be not alarmed, gentle friend, at this announcement of our royalty. Our rank and power are as unsubstantial as our kingdom. Moreover, our condescension to common mortals like thyself can only be equalled by that of the Emperor of Morocco, who, when he is disposed to be particularly gracious, cutteth off the heads of his servants with his own royal scimitar. Wherefore approach and perpend. We would have some conversation with thee, touching some points of philosophy. Thou art a "learned Theban"—but we shall not question thee on "the cause of thunder." We only mean to take thee to task respecting thy experiences as a dreamer of dreams—or rather to enlighten thy outer darkness with some electric flashes from our own pericranium.

"Our life is two-fold—Sleep hath its own world." So said Byron, and so will say all who have ever thought about the matter. Life is indeed divided, more or less equally in different individuals, between the thoughts of wakefulness and those of repose. Shade of Berkeley, tell us whether of the twain are the more "high-fantastical"? We get up in the morning, (I do so, now and then, but I never relished much to "snuff the morning air," though there is ghostly authority for the practice,) and a multitude of ideas, like the waves of a river

"Which runs, and as it runs, for ever shall run on,"

pass over our sensoria, "bide their time," and pass away—make "themselves air, into which they vanish." We lie down at night, and another multitude of ideas passes over the aforesaid sensoria with greater rapidity, and with a wildness and incoherency peculiar to themselves. As the thoughts of sleep seem but dreams to the waker, are not the thoughts of vigilance but as dreams to the sleeper? Do not the aforesaid two portions of life uniformly accuse each other of dreaming? And followeth it not, by all the laws of ratiocination, that life itself is but a dream? Methinks it is a pleasant thought, to contemplate the world in the light of one stupendous dormitory, in which all the families of the race are fast asleep, and in which life only enacts the part of the bellman, just giving them a stir that they may sleep more soundly. Already, methinks, I see the poppy triumphant over the myrtle and the laurel. Like the sound of the sea heard at a distance and at night, I hear the heavy breathing of the somnolent world. Silence, thou nasal orator! Dost thou think that thou art yet in thy conventicle? Where didst thou get those horrid dreams of thine? Shall so many noble beings be undone, and *thou* be one of the elect? Dost thou think that damning others will save thyself? What speakest thou about the justice of God, and the lake of everlasting fire, and the prince of darkness and his angels? Can he not find thee a place, as sub-deputy-tormentor, as an under-familiar of the holy office below? I tell thee, it is all a dream—a foul and pestilent dream—an infernal Fata Morgana of thy own crazy brain. Drink mandragora, man, and learn to sleep more soundly. What, chattering still? Up, and be waking! Look where I point thee. What is that thou seest? It is the glorious sun coming out of his ocean-bower. See how he turneth the sky around him into gold. Ah, well did one John Milton, a poor old London blind man, term him "the arch-chymic sun!" The worst of it is, he too is a dreamer, and maketh nothing but visionary gold. But I forget thee, thou owl of religion!—and well I may—for what dost thou here? Nodding again! Look up, and tell me what thou seest? Is *that* sight in harmony with thy damnatory creed? Could the same God have made the Sun and the Devil? "Go thou, and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Lost time! Vain trouble! "He has no speculation in those eyes, that he doth glare with"—he is again talking in his sleep—Atonement—Election—Regeneration—"What will the line stretch out to the crack o' doom?" Sleep on, thou solemn buzzard—as thou wilt, I believe, till the last trump shall waken thee.

But I hear something louder than this orthodox thunder. Methinks it comes from "the sides of the north." The mountains of Poland are communing with each other; and the watchword of Liberty is passing from rock to rock. The pine-forests are murmuring something about Kosciusko, and the awakening eagle is shaking his wings as if he had but just recovered his freedom. Go on, noble Poles! If the Russian Xerxes comes, let him find a new Leonidas, and a happier Thermopylæ. There may be Marathons out of Attica. Let not men say, like Hamlet the Dane, "Why then the Polack never will defend it;" but let them see how dear to the noble and the brave are the country of their birth and the freedom of their fathers. Wake, gallant Poles! and "sleep no more." Day is breaking over all the world—and it is an unhealthy custom to sleep in the day-time. Your climate surely does not require a *siesta*. In Spain it may do pretty well, for there the sleep of the free and fortunate Spaniard is watched over by the police, and by Ferdinand the Beloved. In Portugal too, it may be safe and pleasant; for there reigns a prince of the true royal blood, who respects so much the liber-

ties of the subject, that he has taken the whole of them into his own princely keeping. But in Poland it will never do—so take our advice and do not go to sleep again. We hear that you have had some disagreeable dreams—that you were crushed by a night-mare which you call Autocracy, and haunted by a half-human incubus, who bore the name of Constantine. We are concerned to hear it—but we impute it all to indigestion—and advise you by all means to take some Tartar emetic. We have consulted John Abernethy respecting you.—He advised *us* to purchase his book, and *you* to take some *tincture of steel*. This, however, we would delay, until the emetic has operated. When your digestive organs are freed from their present acrid and fretting accumulations, we would then advise you to complete the cure by taking the advice of the aforesaid eminent man. Depend upon it, it will do you good. And in future, gallant Polacks! attempt not to live upon food which agrees so ill with your constitution. It brings on indigestion, and indigestion, in turn, produces all those troublesome fancies which make your long polar nights so wretched. Our private opinion is, that you have endured it too long—but better late than never—and we are glad to hear that you are thinking about *rising*. Do not forget the tincture of steel—it is an excellent tonic—and your constitution requires it.

It seemeth to us as if there were a regular Swing Union among the nations to disturb us. They will not let us *sleep*. “A nap—a nap—my kingdom for a nap!” But it may not be—they will not let us be quiet. And—the wretches!—not only do they know how to direct the aim, but how to time the blow at such a crisis, that it shall seem and *be* doubly intolerable. It seemeth to us but as yesterday—that sad affair at Paris. We recollect it well, too well for our satisfaction. It was during the hottest part of last summer, and we had determined upon taking a most prolonged and voluptuous *siesta*. Alas, for the expectations of man! His hopes are like the fruits of that melancholy shore, where death appears to live and life to die. He biteth, and spluttereth forth the unsavoury and abominable deception. So it fared with us, in the summer of 1830. We had just drawled out—

O qui nos gelidis in vallibus Hæmi
Sistat, et ingenti ramorum protegat umbrâ!

when what should we hear but a tremendous hubbub from Paris, accompanied with cries indicative of another Revolution! We hate Revolutions. They are the great disturbers of the ancient peace of the world—“*wakening the realms of chaos and old night*.” We sprang from our sofa, went up to the top of George-Hill, climbed the only tree we could find, and looked over the channel. A very pretty sight we saw there. A very respectable old gentleman was moving away with his wig on fire—and an illegitimate Parisian was throwing the royal petticoat of the Duchess of Angoulême out of a window of the Tuilleries. Horrid profanation! Another was taking the same liberty with a hair-cloth shirt, which had been the garment of the son of St. Louis, when he went to masquerade. Abominable illegitimates! But there was more yet—“there’s pippins and cheese to come.” They chose another king for themselves, and made him swear to protect their rights and liberties. The rights and liberties of the people in the nineteenth century! “O tempora! O mores!” Knowledge has undone us. We shall soon not have a chain to put on, or a dungeon to creep into. “Age, thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods”—or thou never couldst have put up with these awful innovations. “It is most tolerable, and not to be endured.” To think of a king reigning by any other than “the right

divine of kings to govern wrong!"—swearing to a liberal charter in the face of the blushing world!—and, finally, accepting the crown at the hands of his people, amid *their* tears, his own, and those of his affectionate family! What will the world come to, when a king believes himself a man? How will they wipe the tears of Louis-Philippe from the crown of Henri the Fourth and Louis the Fourteenth? I grew excessively wroth—got down from my tree—and took a nap at the bottom of it.

I had but just got into a dull sort of dream, about a people "sitting every man under his vine and his fig-tree, with none to make them afraid," when I was disturbed by another sound in the same direction. I resumed my station, and lo, a gigantic town-crier going up and down the towns and cities of Belgium, offering *five shillings* for a king, and proclaiming that the people were tired of eating *oranges*. "Dear stars!" I exclaimed, in the spirit of the apostrophes of the great Laker, "Dear stars!" what will they do now? Little did I think I should live to see the time when the crown went hunting the king, like 'Cœlebs in search of a Wife.' These are the fruits of the march of intellect—this is what comes of enlightening the people! Big-wigged man of power, this is the interpretation of thy dark saying, "The schoolmaster is abroad." Better he had remained at home. We shall soon not have darkness enough for sleep. Knowledge and freedom! we despise them—give us back despotism, and tithes, and taxes. Go to your beds, ye political fire-flies, and let the stream flow on as darkly as before. We did not feel the cold, until you awoke us to tell us we had no blankets. Go to your beds—and "let the world sleep on."

Thus I lamented—and now the sun began to set behind the blue paradise of the moorland hills. "Ah!" thought I, "*ye* have no Reformers, beautiful eternities! No Brougham has sent a schoolmaster to illuminate the Torrs—there is no contention about the sovereignty of the mountains! No innovator"—But here I bethought me of the rail-road and Sir Thomas Tyrwhit, turned my back upon the mountains, and walked sleepily home.

Feb. 13, 1831.

THE SAINT SIMONITES.

(Continued from p. 88.)

THE second and third parts of the "Nouveau Christianisme" of Saint Simon never appeared. His death followed shortly upon the publication referred to in our last number. His followers have recently published an 8vo. volume of the public expositions of their opinions, "Doctrines de St. Simon. Exposition. Première année, 1828, 1829." This has reached a second edition. We shall avail ourselves of an able and extended analysis of it in the *Revue Encyclopédique*. The needful abridgment to fit it for our publication will hardly, we fear, suffer us to do justice to the original publication.

"In casting an impartial glance over European society, unquestionably at the head of civilization, it is impossible not to be struck with the spectacle of the disagreement which prevails in opinions, principles of action, and material interests, as well general as individual. Society is subdivided into a multiplicity of sects calling themselves religious or philosophic: sects which throughout the three last centuries were united by their common hatred of

Catholicism, against which they were all directed, but which now, that the ultramontane phantom no longer threatens, except to the eye of the visionary, separate more and more widely, and dispute with each other. We see Protestantism in all its shades, pure Deism, and the most decided Atheism. It is the same in the world of politics. As long as the feudal system shewed itself formidable, all parties were for the time united to attack it: but its presence alone was the cause of their agreement. Such are the consequences of negative doctrines; there is no real harmony between them but for the purposes of destruction.

"The state of the fine arts, as indicative of the tone of moral feeling, presents an afflicting image. What are the poetical accents which find the most ready echo in our souls? Those of sorrow. Strokes of bitter irony are applauded, and heartlessness, which is nothing else than *égoïsme*, is paraded with an impudence which, in itself, is a verdict against that society in which it does not excite disgust. We know that in the fine arts the satirical and elegiac forms are preferred, and both these forms attack the social feelings, either by the passionate expression of despair, or by a contempt, whose infernal laugh tends to the pollution of all that is pure and sacred. To attest what we have said, do we want any farther proof than the kind of complacency with which our inferiority in the fine arts is generally admitted? This fact seems to us conclusive, when we consider that it is by the sympathetic language of the fine arts that the social conduct of man is influenced, that he is drawn to see his private interest in that of the whole; that the fine arts, in a word, which comprise all eloquence, poetry, painting, architecture, and music, are sources of devotedness, of strong and tender affections, and not mere exercises of technical skill. The tone of modesty with which our age expresses itself on its inferiority in the fine arts, contrasts curiously with its pretension with regard to works of positive utility, those of science and industry."

The want of an organized and progressive scientific system is lamented. In the pursuits of industry, a spirit of rivalry and jealousy leads to the concealment of discoveries and inventions, experiments already made are repeated, works already accomplished are recommenced, and each one surrounds himself with mystery, that his individual interest may not suffer from plagiarism. Thus do selfish interests prevent that diffusion of knowledge, and that co-operation, which would be so valuable, and save so many useless efforts. Each individual, isolated and surrounded by others whom he regards as his natural enemies, solely because they are engaged in similar pursuits, which ought, on the contrary, to be a source of sympathy, finds his only resource in artifice, let us say the word *fraud*, to establish his fortune on the ruin of others. Has he a new invention which, given to the public, would receive numerous "improvements? He either entrenches himself behind a patent, the fruitful source of frauds and lawsuits, or puts his discovery to use with the greatest secrecy; and he prefers, for fear of robbery, rather to leave his discovery imperfect, than to consult a more skilful inquirer. The same fear prevents his asking information on the wants of consumption. He remains also here without any other compass than his own observation, always incomplete. Hence arises perseverance in blind and retrograde proceedings, the want of equilibrium between production and consumption—hence, in short, failures without number, and those commercial panics which terrify speculators, and stop the execution of the best projects."

"Ought not this afflicting picture to make us desire a new social doctrine, which, establishing harmony between the different modes of human activity, may assure for the future, to the heart, mind, and energies of man, that peace for which they are created? Does it not witness to us that the moment is arrived for the production of a new doctrine? Is the anarchy we have just retraced the definitive condition of society? All our sympathies declare the contrary, and the desires of humanity are the prophecies of its future. Humanity has never wished for progression in vain. Science comes here to aid

its sympathies, to justify its predictions; she permits us not only to hope, but to believe, in a future essentially different from the present. This belief, at once rational and delightful, rests on the knowledge of the law of human development, a law discovered by St. Simon, as we discover all things, by a spontaneous movement of intelligence, but which he has verified by the positive method pursued in the physical sciences."

For the details of this method, its application and value, the reader is referred to the third Lecture.

"Mankind, says St. Simon, should be considered as a collective being, (*être collectif*,) developing itself in successive generations, as the individual is developed in the succession of years. This development is progressive, it is subject to a law which may be called the physiological law of the human race. Others before him, Vico, Lessing, Turgot, Kant, Herder, Condorcet, had approached more or less nearly to the idea of perfectibility, which in the present day seems generally admitted. St. Simon alone has rendered it fruitful, by characterizing its progress, assigning it an end, shewing how it has operated, and how it should be carried forward. The development of human society does not go on in a continuous manner, but by alternate phases, which the new doctrine terms the organic and critical epochs of humanity. (*Epoques organiques, époques critiques.*) In the first, humanity (mankind) conceives to itself a destination, and hence results, for social activity, a determinate tendency. Education and legislation direct to a common end all action, thought, and sentiment. The social hierarchy becomes the expression of this end, and is so regulated as best to attain it. Then it is that the authorities which exist are legitimate, sovereign, in the true sense of the words. One general character pervades all organic epochs—they are religious. Religion then embraces all the operations of human activity; it is, in a word, the social synthesis. The critical epochs present characters diametrically opposite; during their course, mankind no longer knows its destination; society has no determined object of activity; education and legislation are uncertain in their aim; they appear incessantly in contradiction with the manners, customs, and wants of society. The public authorities are no longer the expression of a real social hierarchy (body); they are stripped of authority, and even the feeble action they continue to exercise is contested. One general feature is predominant over these, the critical epochs are irreligious. The critical epochs divide themselves into two distinct periods: in the first, we see the minds of a fraction of society, becoming gradually more and more important, unite in design and action for a common end, namely, the ruin of the ancient, moral, and political order of things: in the second, which is the interval between destruction and re-edification, we see no longer thought or enterprise common to all—all is resolved into individualities, and pure *égoïsme* is dominant."

The historical series, extending from the time of ancient Greece to the present, exhibit two organic and two critical epochs. The first organic epoch is constituted by polytheism, and terminates at the commencement of the philosophic era in Greece; the second commences with Christianity, and concludes at the end of the 15th century. The first critical epoch extends from the appearance of the Grecian philosophers to the preaching of the gospel; the second, from the time of Luther to the present. All the societies of Europe are at present engaged in a greater or less degree in the second period of this last critical epoch, and as, after the ruin of polytheism and the disorders which accompanied it, the human race ranged itself under a new religious law; so in the present day, after the *decline of Christianity*,* which has been going on for the last three centuries, humanity is preparing itself to enter into a new, moral, and political state.

* See our remarks at the close of the article.

" We have seen the course followed by the developments of society : let us now shew the definitive end to which it aspires, amidst the alternations of apparent elevations and depressions commonly called the vicissitudes of humanity, and which are nothing else than the series of efforts made in its progressive career. This end is the universal association ; that is to say, the association of all men on the entire surface of the globe in all their various relations.

" This universal association, foretold by St. Simon, and of which the name itself is a definition, is the state in which all human powers will be harmoniously combined. This can only be in a pacific direction, and it is impossible to conceive for it any other object of action, than the improvement and embellishment of the globe for the benefit of its inhabitants. All trace of *antagonism* must then disappear, and with it all oppression exercised by the strong over the weak. In a word, the development of humanity may be expressed in the following terms, similar in substance to the decline of antagonism and growth of association ; namely, the gradual diminution of the use (*exploitation*) of man by his fellow-man. The more and more perfect use (*exploitation*) of the globe by man. We see that effectively these are corresponding terms, and we may resume them in the formula adopted by the school of St. Simon—constant amelioration, moral, physical, and intellectual, of the most numerous, the poorest class.

" Societies have originated (*débuté*) in war, the strongest expression of the state of antagonism. The most general result of war is the dominion of physical force, at first established by massacre and cannibalism. The institution of slavery, as succeeding to brutal ferocity, must be considered a progress ; the prisoner, no longer condemned to inevitable death, is preserved by the conqueror to become in his hands an instrument of production. The use thus made of man includes his physical, intellectual, and moral life. The slave is put out of the pale of humanity. He belongs to his master as much as his land, his cattle, his furniture—he is his property. The slave has no rights, not even that of life. His days are in the hand of his master ; he may mutilate him at pleasure, appropriate him as he will. The slave is not only condemned to want and bodily suffering, but also to moral and intellectual brutalization ; he has no name, no family, no property, no ties of affection, no recognized relation either to God or man : for the slave there are no gods, the gods are only for the master.

" Such at first is slavery—gradually the condition becomes less rigorous—the Legislature interferes in his relations with his master—by little and little he ceases to be mere passive matter—a small portion of the profit of his labour is granted to him. The laws recognize his existence. It is long ere he can pretend by manumission, always the rare exception, to make a step toward civil and religious society, to introduce his family slowly into the rank of man, where it is still proscribed and made use of for the benefit of others, as long as its origin can be recognized.

" Christianity, proclaiming at the same time the unity of God and the brotherhood of man, changes completely the religious and political relations—the relations of man to God, and of man to man. At the commencement of its rule, there still exist two classes of men, one subjected to the other ; but the condition of this class is sensibly improved. The serf is no longer, like the slave, the direct property of his master—he is only attached to the soil, from which he cannot be separated ; he gathers a portion of his labours ; he has a family ; his existence is recognized by the civil law, and still more by that of religion. The moral life of the slave had nothing in common with that of the master : the lord and the serf have the same God, the same faith, and receive the same religious instruction ; the same spiritual aid is given them by the minister of the altar. The soul of the serf is not less precious in the eye of the Supreme Being than that of the lord ; it is more so ; for according to the gospel, the poor are the chosen of God. The family of the

serf is sanctified, as well as that of the lord himself. This situation, incomparably superior to that of the slave, is still only provisional; more advanced, the serf is detached from the glebe; he obtains what may be called the right of locomotion; he may then choose his master. Doubtless after this, which may, strictly speaking, be called his emancipation, the serf remains in some respects marked with the impress of servitude; he is still subject to personal services, to labours of vassalage; he pays feudal dues; but these exactions diminish daily.

"At last, the whole of the laborious class as to bodily service, makes a decided progress; it acquires a political capacity by the establishment of municipal bodies.

"If, as we have seen, the situation of the poorest and most numerous class has been gradually ameliorated, there is still much to accomplish; for the use of man, for and by man, has not ceased; it continues to a great extent between proprietors and labourers, between masters and those who work for hire. The relative condition of these two classes in the present day, is, without doubt, very different from that between master and slave, the serf and his lord—so different, that at the first glance there seems no connexion between them; nevertheless, we must admit that they are but the prolongation of each other. The relation of the master with the hired labourer is the last change which slavery has undergone; it is enough to take a glance at what passes around us, to be convinced that the workman is, excepting in degree, made use of materially, intellectually, and morally, as the slave was formerly. It is evident, in fact, that he can hardly provide by his labour for his own immediate wants, and that to work or not is not free to him. He aggravates the difficulties of his position, if he is imprudent enough to believe himself destined to participate in that which makes the happiness of the rich—if he takes a companion, and has a family around him. Can the workman, pressed down by the want to which he is reduced, find time for the expansion of his intellectual faculties, his moral affections? Can he even entertain the desire for it? Or, if he has an instinctive wish for improvement, who will furnish him the means? Who will place science within his reach? Who will receive the overflowings of his heart? No one thinks of him; physical suffering leads him to brutalization, brutalization to depravity, the source of new misery; a vicious circle in which every point inspires disgust and horror, when it ought only to call forth pity. Such is the situation of the greater number of labourers, those who compose in every society the immense majority of the population. And yet this fact, so revolting to every just feeling, is to the present day unnoticed by our political speculators. The moral dogma that no man ought to be incapacitated by his birth, has long been admitted by enlightened minds; political constitutions in these latter times have expressly sanctioned it. It seems, then, that the making use of man by man—result of the classifications we have just pointed out—would lead us to think that these classes are necessarily varying, and that continued change takes place in the families and individuals composing them; but, in fact, there is no such change: the advantages and disadvantages of each social position are transmitted by inheritance, and political economists have taken care to verify the fact of the hereditary transmission of misery."

The existing constitution of the rights of property, based as they are on conquest, is then considered and contrasted with natural rights, which claim for all the free exercise of their powers, without distinction of birth, and their classification according to their aptitudes and tastes, and the conclusion is, that the present system of property and mode of transmitting it, ought to be changed.

That important changes have been made in these rights of property is then shewn in the instances of transitions by legal enactments from slavery to villainage, and thence to feudal service, by the restrictions on entails and other changes in the laws of inheritance. It is suggested that, as a sequel to

these progressive advances which have been made towards opening a free course to personal desert, a new system should be established, in which the state, and not the family, should inherit accumulated property—and that this should be again appropriated according to the respective capabilities of individuals—property as the instrument of labour, passing from hands which have well employed it to those who best know how to do so after them; that as at present the magistrate succeeds the magistrate, the statesman the statesman, the warrior the warrior, so in future the artist should succeed to the artist, the learned to the man of learning, the artisan to the artisan, &c.

History, they say, supports this system. She tells us that the various modes of classification which have followed each other, have always tended to weaken the principle of inheritance by blood, to replace it by that of inheritance by aptitude. By the laws of Caste, every thing was transmitted from father to son, from the highest rank to the most inferior occupation. Nearer our own time, political functions passed by inheritance, as dukes, barons, &c., were but public functionaries; later, only certain dignities, rights, and honorary titles. In the most advanced European societies, one privilege chiefly is still transmissible by the chances of birth—that of wealth. Public opinion is loudly expressed against the other remains of the feudal institutions, and it belongs to sound reason to pronounce that this last must follow the fate of the rest; that the same mode of transmission, virtually at least adopted for them, is also applicable to wealth. To abolish the present system of inheritance is no more to destroy property, than the abolition of castes was to destroy professions, or the overthrow of feudalism, the destruction of political functions. It is to extend to all men the rights hitherto reserved to a few; it is to give to every one an inheritance, since all property becoming a function, a public trust, every labourer will succeed to a superior of his own class. The imputation of advocating a community of goods is disavowed: in an address to the Chamber of Deputies where such a charge had been made, it is declared, that such an equal partition would be to their views an injustice more revolting than the unequal division first effected by the force of arms; that the moral law they have been commissioned to teach, demands that “each one should be placed according to his capacity, and rewarded according to his works.”

To effect changes such as are here contemplated, no other means are suggested but those of persuasion and conviction; “it is not an overthrow, a revolution, which is desired; it is an *evolution*, a radical change in sentiment and idea, and consequently in material interests.”

We cannot here enter into the details of the plans by which these principles are to be brought into operation; it will be enough to state that a national bank is suggested as the grand inheritor of all property, and that by means of its ramifications throughout society, estimates of the wants and capabilities of the people and consequent appropriations are to be made.

“Education is naturally divided into two kinds—moral or general, and professional or specific; the object of the former is to place the ideas and feelings in harmony with the end of society; it takes up man from his cradle and accompanies him to the end of life. The more direct this education is in its influence the less necessary is the restrictive interference of legislation. The importance of education, always great, has become so, more and more, as social interests have become more complicated and the means of action improved. In ancient times each citizen, called to discuss the interests of the community in public, was in a situation sufficiently elevated to understand the connexion between his individual acts and the general interests; but this did not excuse him from a previous education, which gave him knowledge of that society of which he was a member; nevertheless, behold the pomp of the Olympic Games, the mysteries, the religious ceremonies, the numerous class of priests, sibyls, augurs; every where, a living instruction in the social destinies awakened enthusiasm and devotedness. This state of things is changed—a nation is no

longer contained within the walls of a city—the interests common to all can no longer be debated by all assembled together. The division of labour, one of the essential conditions of the progress of civilization, by inclosing individuals in a circle constantly narrowing, has carried them more and more away from the consideration of general interests; and, that whilst these considerations become more difficult to comprehend on account of the complication of the social relations, the intensity and regularity of moral education ought then to keep pace with the division of labour, as it alone is capable of giving to men those comprehensive views which it is the tendency of the individualization of labour to destroy.”

“General education must be the same for all, as they will all be called to live in a society uniformly organized; but special or individual education, including the cultivation of the feelings—the intellectual and bodily powers, fit to make artists, men of science, and artisans, (this triple division includes the whole of society,) will be given, without regard to birth, with regard only to individual organization.”

No one will be devoted, by a sort of hereditary fatality, to an occupation contrary to his faculties or inclination.

After a primary education equally preparatory to all destinations, the children, whose tendencies have been carefully studied and consulted by skilful masters, will be distributed in the three great schools of fine arts, sciences, and industry. However numerous may be the subdivisions of these schools, we can understand the necessity of an education common to artists, as artists, as well as for men of science, as such, and for artisans as artisans. It will not be till after this second preparation that the youth, now fixed in their career, will be distributed among the different schools of practical instruction. Here the pupils will remain until the society believes them sufficiently taught to confide to them the functions for the due discharge of which they have been qualified; all functions, all occupations will be filled and carried on with a higher degree of perfection, and thus must a much more rapid progress be made in every branch of human activity.

Division of labour has been with reason considered as one of the most powerful causes of the progress of civilization; but it is evident that this division will not produce all its fruits, until it has taken for its basis the difference of capacity in its agents.

The object of legislation is the teaching and maintenance of the moral rule; it is divided into two parts, negative and positive, or penal and remuneratory. The legislation of the new organic epoch, St. Simonian, will be simple; “it is, indeed, almost needless to say this after having spoken of the abolition of inheritance, the source of the greater part of judicial proceedings; it will be easy to comprehend and respect it, the social object or end being known and loved by all; all that favours the development of feeling, the intellectual and bodily powers, is virtue; all that impedes this development is vice. In every class of society each individual will have his immediate superiors for his judges; the men best able to appreciate all the attendant circumstances. Penal legislation, in short, will be softened in its forms; it will have no other object than to submit to a particular mode of education those men who quit the paths pointed out by the common and ordinary education.”

“These considerations, on the two great instruments of social order, shew at once the necessity of a supreme sanction for the precepts recommended by education and prescribed by legislation.—Who are to be the men charged with the direction of instruction? Who shall be the men charged to make the law? Whence comes their mandate? What shall be their character? What their rank in the social hierarchy? What in short shall be this hierarchy, which ought to be the expression of the whole society, of its labours and its conceptions?”

“The solution of these questions is involved in that of an immensely important problem—is there a religious future for humanity? If so, ought re-

ligion to be reduced to a contemplation purely individual? Must it be considered simply an inward meditation, devoid of influence on the social character—the political life? Should not rather this religion of the future present itself as the expression of the collective thought of humanity, as the synthesis of all its conceptions, of all its modes of being? Ought she not to take a prominent place in the political order and govern it wholly?"

It is in the last sense that the problem is solved by the school of St. Simon. Feeling that the present age (at least in France) is strongly against any new examination of this vital question, many pages are devoted to inculcate its importance and necessity; it points out that the irreligion of our epoch is only that which characterises all critical epochs, is only the effect of the antipathies entertained against an old doctrine become inadequate, and against those institutions which are its demonstration; that in another point of view it is no more than the effect of this fact, that man, when contemplating the universe and his own existence, fails to perceive there order, harmony, unity; but humanity tends invincibly, by its nature, towards a new conception of order, and, in the moment of seizing it, will return to religion, because order, harmony and unity, are no more than the varied expression of the religious idea.

The sciences have the same basis as all religious structures—God, and a providential plan; far then from being atheistical in their essence, they take their source and find their power in an idea essentially religious; namely, that there is constancy, order, and regularity, in the chain of phenomena; "that, in fact, they contribute, by the progressive discovery of the laws which govern the universe, to give an idea always more and more complete of providential design, and that in this sense it may be said of the sciences, 'that they declare the glory of God.' 'No,' they cry; 'science is not destined to be the eternal enemy of religion, to narrow perpetually its domain, to overthrow it some day entirely; she is called, on the contrary, to extend its empire, to strengthen it incessantly; since, in fact, each step of its progress must result in giving to man a more noble idea of God, and of his designs for humanity. Is it not thus that the most illustrious of those have felt, those men in whose footsteps it is the glory of our men of science to follow? See Newton elevating himself even to the idea of gravitation, and then humbly bending before that God whose will he has discovered. Listen to Kepler giving thanks to God, in a hymn full of enthusiasm, for having revealed to him the simplicity and grandeur of the plan on which he has established the mechanism of the universe. Hear Leibnitz, the greatest of the masters of science according to the expression of De Maistre, declaring that, if he attaches any value to the labours of science, it is above all, that he may have a right to speak of God. In proportion as science is elevated does she approach to religion, and, in fact, the scientific inspiration in its highest degree is one with religious inspiration.'

"Comparing the three general states which, up to the present time, comprehend the religious development of man,—Fetishism, Polytheism, and Monotheism, comprehending Judaism and Christianity, it will appear that the religious sentiment has successively increased in importance with regard both to individual and social life. If we study its influence on individuals, we shall find that the religious tie has been constantly strengthened by the increase of love and veneration towards God, and the growing authority of the doctrine of a future life. In its social influence the progress of religious belief is not less evident by its ever-increasing power of aggregation, attested by the extension of the successive centres of association, family, city, nation, church, corresponding to the successive dogmas of Fetishism, Polytheism, and Monotheism, Jewish and Christian. The school of St. Simon concludes, from this picture, that in the new organic epoch now preparing, religion is destined to make a new, an immense progress, a consequence drawn from the progress made in the past from one organic epoch to another, both in its individual and social value. It proclaims that there is a religious future for humanity; that the religion of the future will be more grand, more powerful than any of

the past; that its dogmas will include, will be the synthesis of all the conceptions or ideas, of all the modes of being of man; that the social political institution, considered as a whole, will be a religious institution. The exposition of the Saint Simonian faith or doctrine, and the political institution which is to carry it into practice, are to be the subjects of a second volume, which is announced."

In continuing our notice of this subject, we are struck with the reflection, how often and how strongly the current of human improvement runs out into new channels, and starts off with a strong impatience of present evils in directions which might have been the least expected. It is heart-cheering to see the youthful ardour with which some of the late aspirants after military glory are throwing away, not the scabbard but the sword, and directing all their talents and energies to the best, the wisest, the noblest warfare, to the conquest of overpowering and all-engrossing selfishness; to inculcate the wickedness and folly of war—the cultivation of all the arts of peace, the mutual love and co-operation of all mankind as brethren, and the especial care of the interests, moral, intellectual and physical, of the poor, the needy, and those who have none to help them. These are the important objects which the followers of Saint Simon profess to have in view, and these they seem resolved to pursue with system and energy; with the strong conviction that the world is in progress, they look back only for instruction; they dwell on the future, and seem to live for it alone. Much of the mass of antiquated prejudice which encumbers the minds, and fetters the actions, of men, has been thrown off by the French. They have had a severe purification; they have dearly purchased their liberation from mental thralldom; with their burthens they lost for a time much of their ballast; may we not hope that the time approaches in which they will prove, that the loss has been but temporary, the gain permanent and incalculable? The Saint Simonites have fallen into the common error of the opponents of Christianity, which, with the Catholic, the Greek, the Lutheran, and other established churches before them, is not matter of wonder. They confound the corruptions of Christianity with Christianity itself, and consequently represent the whole institution as transitory, and about to be superseded by a better, a purer system, their own. But if they will study it a little more profoundly, if they will separate the accumulated dross from the pure gold, and discriminate between that which was of necessity temporary, and applicable only to its first institution, from the pure, simple, eternal principles, which cannot be improved, and which cannot be superseded, they will be satisfied that no new revolution is needed to afford them a basis broad enough to erect a superstructure stable, enduring, and adapted to all the wants of humanity. The influence of a hierarchy such as they propose, would be not a little dangerous, at least until human nature should have made such progress, that the maxim, "We should love each other as brethren," shall have completely annihilated every desire of distinction for its own sake, and every exercise of influence for selfish objects. Should their sanguine expectations be disappointed in the extent of their success, it is yet good thus to draw forth the minds and affections of men, and immense benefit must be produced.

THE CONVERSATIONS OF EBION ADAMSON AND HIS FRIENDS.

No. I.

Present—Ebion Adamson, Barnabas, Elhanan, Theophilus, Caleb, and Philo.

EBION ADAMSON.

WELCOME, my friends; and now at once to business. You have shewn by accepting my invitation to this meeting that you agree with me in considering the Monthly Repository entitled to our support, and that you are disposed to assist it both by contributing to its contents and promoting its circulation. Is it not so?

BARNABAS.

Assuredly. And if we can render it more instrumental in allaying the animosities which embitter so many minds in this sectarian country, and diffusing a kind and brotherly disposition amongst all parties, we shall render good service to the cause of peace and charity, which I hold to be the cause of Christianity.

ELHANAN.

I shall be glad to forward so excellent a purpose. There is but one way of thoroughly accomplishing it; and that is by the dissemination of those principles which are the foundation of charitable feelings. We must teach men the paternal character of the Deity, and his universal love. Then, and then only, will they learn to love one another.

PHILO.

The Monthly Repository ought to do much more than merely put forth the doctrinal sermons and moral exhortations which Elhanan and Barnabas desire its pages to be occupied with. It should be a receptacle for the thoughts of acute and learned men. It should have more of the character of Dr. Priestley's Theological Repository. What excellent criticisms and curious speculations there are in that work! How desirable it is, if possible, that every individual text should be investigated and understood!

CALEB.

Some time will be required to accomplish that. There is a great deal of rubbish to be removed before the building can be put up. We need a besom to sweep the corruptions, and mistranslations, and misinterpretations, and absurdities, and calumnies of Calvinism and Trinitarianism out of the temple. The reformation of nominal Christendom is our first work.

THEOPHILUS.

Except, friend Caleb—and I am sure you will agree with me—the work of devotion and holiness in our own hearts. Whatever we do should be imbued with a spirit of fervent piety, and should tend to excite that spirit in others. The Repository ought to be strongly marked with a devotional character, and have much in it that may be read with advantage on Sunday evenings to our families by our firesides.

EBION ADAMSON.

You are all, I think, in the right; at least so far as none of you are exclusive. The very variety of your co-operation will tend to make it the more efficient. I have communicated with the Editor, as I have anticipated the

way in which you would feel on the subject, as to the best mode of rendering our assistance. [Some details were then gone into, with which it is unnecessary to trouble our readers. The conversation is resumed when it became more general.]

CALEB.

How have the Orthodox Magazines behaved of late ?

EBION ADAMSON.

They have not forgotten the Watchman, and they keep the peace pretty well. Moreover, the best of them begin to perceive that their own creeds and preachments are behind the times in which we live. They want a new translation of the Scriptures. I wish they would try their hands at an Improved Version.

BARNABAS.

The result might moderate their tone when they speak of ours ; which is, in truth, very needlessly offensive.

PHILO.

All light is offensive to the darkness. Criticism is thrown away upon people who only regard the sound of the words and the associations of their childhood.

CALEB.

There is an end of the reproach then that the old Bible would not do for Socinians ; and that they made a new one to answer their own purposes.

EBION ADAMSON.

There is never an end of the reproach which orthodoxy hurls at heresy. If it loses one topic, it will fasten upon another. As to this very point, what has the Improved Version ever been to us ? In how many pulpits has it ever been read ? Who has ever disused the Common Version for the sake of using it ? We have always regarded it as a well-meant and able attempt, and a good help to the study of the New Testament ; and nothing more.

BARNABAS.

How much it would tend to allay disputation, and bring us towards agreement on many points, if some of our best scholars were united with theirs, in order to produce a translation which should be satisfactory to all parties !

CALEB.

Hope it not, brother Barnabas. Greater division is much more likely, than closer union. Are they not making and meditating attacks upon our Trusts and Endowments ? Are they not effecting a local exclusion of us from the Bible Societies, and planning a general one ? Have they not, even now, removed the Anniversary of the Widows' Fund from Jewin Street ?

EBION ADAMSON.

That is rather a bathos of a grievance ; though it certainly shews the animus of the party. But I mentioned this new translation scheme as an indication of their feeling that they were behind the spirit of the age, and must whip up, or be distanced. They shew other symptoms. One would think they had taken a page out of that admirable Sermon of J. J. Tayler's, which so delighted us at the last Anniversary of the Association.

PHILO.

How so ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Hear the Eclectic Review. "Theology must lay aside her gown and slippers, and come forth from her schools, and speak the language of the people. Biblical criticism has rendered the most invaluable service to the cause of scriptural knowledge; but its strength and weakness have both been displayed, and its utmost results are, probably, nearly ascertained; and though true scholarship was never more demanded, all philological trifling, all neological reveries, must be swept away."

PHILO.

Philological trifling! As if any one can divine the tenets of a writer but by the strictest analysis; ascertaining the occasion of an epistle, the design of every paragraph, the construction of every sentence, and the meaning of every word.

ELHANAN.

And the formation of every letter? No, no; they are right there; but I suppose that sneer at "neological reveries" was meant for principles, which, however long lost, are as old as the gospel, and which, in fact, are the gospel.

EBION ADAMSON.

You are both too sensitive. But hear more. "It is all very well to go on reprinting Owen, and Baxter, and Doddridge, although to the reproach of the feebleness and poverty of modern theological literature; but what we now more especially stand in need of is, that the Author of all wisdom would be pleased to raise up some master minds, gifted with the heavenly knowledge, who should be able to create a new literature adapted to the times, and impressed with the characters of sanctity, to introduce also a reform in our schools of religious knowledge, and reinfuse the vigour of genius into Christian theology. Above all this, and in order to all, we need the cordial combination of the good, in heart and in enterprise; and for this we need the spirit of life and love to be poured out abundantly upon us."

BARNABAS.

That is to say, they want a Dr. Channing amongst them. Would that they and we had many such!

ELHANAN.

Amen. And yet I cannot imagine an orthodox Dr. Channing. When I look at the intellectual and moral character of his writings, he seems to me to be so completely an incarnation of the spirit, not of Antitrinitarian, but of Unitarian Christianity, that I could not recognize his identity under the influence of what are called orthodox doctrines.

BARNABAS.

What say you to Fenelon?

ELHANAN.

Why that Fenelon was not a man of doctrines; that he was no creedist; his brain just worked as his heart and soul commanded it, and elaborated into thoughts the pure emotions which constituted his religion.

EBION ADAMSON.

An orthodox Channing would certainly be an anomaly. That mental freedom which he advocates could not be recommended nor exercised by one who started with the notion that heaven had dictated a string of abstract propositions to us, some unintelligible; some, so far as we can see, contra-

dictory ; and all to be believed on peril of eternal suffering. Even if a man were free in choosing such a religion, it would only be the freedom of choosing the chains with which his intellect was to be for ever after manacled. And how could the love and hope which are the very life of Channing's soul, co-exist with the practical influences of the faith which denies the universality of the Creator's love, and the possibility of salvation, to all eternity, of countless multitudes of his human offspring ? No, he is essentially ours ; and must be while he is himself. Yet I like their wishing for such a thing ; their blind groping after some higher development of humanity than their system has produced, or indeed than it ever can produce. It is something for them to begin to feel that more light and power are needed to guide and controul humanity in its progress.

PHILO.

But they will never get more light or more power by forsaking the literal interpretation of the written word, and neglecting to apply the just principles of criticism to the text and the interpretation.

EBION ADAMSON.

Let criticism do its work, and a very needful and useful work it is ; but there is much more to be done. We must advance from interpretation to application ; from studying the letter of the word to imbibing its spirit ; and that spirit must be made to bear upon the peculiar circumstances of the times and country in which we live.

BARNABAS.

You would not plunge us into the stormy waters of politics ? It would only produce dissension among ourselves, and increase the odium in which others hold us.

EBION ADAMSON.

With mere party politics, with the squabbles of parties for place, heaven forbid we should have any thing to do. But politics, in the proper sense of the word, are a branch of morals ; and if religion does not regulate morality, what does it regulate ?

CALEB.

You think a good Christian ought to support the present ministry ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Not quite so. I think he ought to support those political principles which have raised them to power ; and which, if they attempt to compromise, they will surely fall, as they ought to fall, a hissing and a by-word to the world. The Reform Question will try them. The ides of March are come. They must either play Cæsar or Brutus.

BARNABAS.

Would you have our ministers preach on retrenchment, corn laws, vote by ballot, and sympathy with all the revolutionists of the continent ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Brother Barnabas, I know you are a man of peace ; but would not you have theft, falsehood, and doing the opposite of what we would be done unto, preached against, and that vigorously ?

BARNABAS.

They are universally known and allowed to be vices.

EBION ADAMSON.

True ; and does not the man who uses the power over his dependent,

which is given him by the plan of open voting, to make that dependent vote for his nominee, and who thereby degrades the voter, and gets a nominal representative returned to support the monopoly in which he is interested, commit all these three vices at once; or at least cause them to be committed and multiplied?

PHILO.

But the people to whom the Apostles preached had no popular elections, no political rights.

EBION ADAMSON.

And therefore there are no direct precepts against such iniquities. But vice is not to escape the lash of religion merely by shifting into a new form. Now-a-days, it is chiefly in politics that we must do, or violate, our duty to our neighbour. If Christianity does not apply to these circumstances, it is an obsolete religion, and we had better look out for a new one.

PHILO.

The Saint Simonian?

EBION ADAMSON.

Aye, the Saint Simonian, in that case. Though I take its disciples to be much better Christians than they themselves imagine.

THEOPHILUS.

Christians? Why they have directly attacked Christianity!

BARNABAS.

But that has often been done by men who were disgusted with the corrupt form in which the gospel was exhibited to them, who yet would have loved and prized the reality.

THEOPHILUS.

Their notions of the Deity are no better than Pantheism; they say *the universe lives*, and they call that God; and their worship seems to be nothing more than the enjoyment of the fine arts. This would be a sad exchange for uniting with a congregation to worship the Father of Christ in spirit and in truth.

EBION ADAMSON.

An exchange which I certainly have no thought of making. The theology of the Simonites does seem to be a very crude affair. They feel the necessity of some religion; Catholicism has fallen in France, to rise no more; and so they have put together an extempore theology, which is very unworthy of their intellects, for they have some of the best heads in France amongst them.

THEOPHILUS.

And the best hearts too?

EBION ADAMSON.

Not impossible; but I was not thinking of their theological doctrine. Their views of history, the ways in which they trace the orderly progress of the human race, are, however, a noble commentary on the truth of a Providence; and their social objects seem to me to be all one great application of the Christian principle of man's fraternity; a practical exposition of the text, that "God made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." They contemplate a social arrangement in which every man shall be placed according to his capacity, and rewarded according to his works. No one is to be idle; no regard to be had to birth; but each, according to the nature and degree of his powers, is to be employed in increasing the common means of enjoyment.

ELHANAN.

Utopia come again. What motives are to impel men to this?

EBION ADAMSON.

The pursuit of their own happiness. A sufficient motive surely.

THEOPHILUS.

And not, then, obedience or submission to the will of God?

EBION ADAMSON:

Is not the will of God the happiness of his creatures?

THEOPHILUS.

Ultimately it is. But it often involves much present suffering and self-denial.

EBION ADAMSON.

Yet the better we understand his will and our own happiness, the more we perceive their identity. To ascertain what produces the greatest amount of human happiness, individual and collective, present and future, is infallibly to ascertain the will of God.

ELHANAN.

Hence it is that you argue for the inclusion of politics in religion.

EBION ADAMSON.

Certainly. The happiness of the people of England, at the present time, is probably far more diminished by open voting, with its consequences, of oppression, falsehood, demoralization, and selfish legislation, than it is by all the direct thievery and lying in the country.

PHILO.

But you have no apostolic precept.

EBION ADAMSON.

Nor have you apostolic sanction for your canons of criticism and rules of interpretation; and for the same reason—biblical criticism and representative government were both of later growth.

ELHANAN.

You might find a text too; though you must still deal with it only by way of inference: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour."

EBION ADAMSON.

And as I incline to Mr. Cappe's opinion, that all doctrines are doctrines of inference, I should not think the worse of a precept for being in the same predicament.

CALEB.

Are the Simonites prospering?

EBION ADAMSON.

Very much. Their public orations on Sundays, and their meetings for instruction on other days, are regularly announced in *Le Globe*, which has now become their avowed and official paper. The list is almost as long as that of the theatrical representations.

THEOPHILUS.

I fear almost as vain. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

ELHANAN.

The beginning; but perfect love casteth out fear; and what if these clever lads jump at once into the fifth form of the Great Master's school?

THEOPHILUS.

I should not expect them to be well grounded in the rudiments. But we should not talk lightly of this. How goes on the Unitarian Association?

BARNABAS.

Very well, except that the revenues run short of the occasion for them. The City Mission, which was recommended by the Meeting at Manchester, has been discussed, and a plan arranged; but it waits, together with other good things, for the means by which it must be realized.

EBION ADAMSON.

Then let the means be asked for. The Unitarian public which directed the measure to be considered, will never leave their agents without resources for carrying their own instructions into effect.

PHILO.

I am ashamed to say that I do not know what a City Mission means.

THEOPHILUS.

Read the Reports of Dr. Tuckerman, of Boston, who is employed by the American Unitarian Association. He is a minister at large for the poor of the city. He seeks out and visits the poor, the sick, the ignorant, and the distressed. He becomes acquainted with those who cannot, or who will not, come to our places of worship. He brings instruction and consolation home to the hovels of those who most need it, and who, though they did not seek, rarely refuse it. He endeavours to turn men from the error of their ways, and bring them from darkness to light. He introduces their children into the nearest schools that will receive them. He is the almoner of the rich, and the friend, both temporal and spiritual, of "the needy and those that have none to help them."

BARNABAS.

An excellent work! But would it not be best undertaken in connexion with other denominations? Surely we need not be sectarian in our charities.

EBION ADAMSON.

What are we to do? Others will not unite with us. The history of the Christian Tract Society has sufficiently shewn that. We may, indeed, subscribe to their Missionaries; but that does not avoid the evil of sectarianism. We know that they will only inculcate the Christianity of Calvinism. We should be promoting the worst kinds of sectarianism. No option is left us. We must be charitable alone, or not charitable at all.

THEOPHILUS.

Collision with others is avoided as much as possible by Dr. Tuckerman, and will be here. He always avoids those who have been taken charge of by other religionists. The field of poverty, vice, and misery, is unhappily quite large enough, even in Boston—much more in London. There is no occasion for the labourers to jostle one another.

ELHANAN.

Nor does he teach Antitrinitarianism, or any other *ism* or *anti*; but simply the gospel of Christ.

CALEB.

How can this be called promoting Unitarianism? For that I understand to be the object of the Association.

EBION ADAMSON.

For a very plain reason, namely, that it is promoting Christianity. If it

be desirable to cut away the faith of a Calvinist until you leave nothing but the genuine gospel, it is surely not less desirable to introduce that very same gospel into a mind which has no faith or knowledge whatever. Nay, as your Calvinist is usually much the most moral man of the two, there is more Unitarianism in practice, and not less in theory, created in the conversion of the ignorant than in that of the Calvinist.

BARNABAS.

But is not this a sort of local charity which the London Unitarians ought to support of themselves?

THEOPHILUS.

The hundreds of Lancashire and Yorkshire and Cheshire Unitarians who passed the resolution when we met at Cross-Hall Street, deemed it an object of general interest. The Londoners will of course supply the poor's-purse of the Missionary; but as to the rest, the mission is no more local than every mission must be, and its importance ought to be felt as much at the Land's End as in Cheapside.

EBION ADAMSON.

There must be a beginning somewhere; and London seems the fittest place. It is to be hoped the plan will soon be extended to all our large towns. Those of their inhabitants who wish it, will, of course, endeavour to promote the success of the first experiment.

ELHANAN.

I hear that Dr. Tuckerman thinks that so much good has been effected in America, and would be effected in London, by this plan, that he has expressed his readiness to cross the Atlantic and traverse England on a begging expedition, pleading the cause of our own poor to our own hearts and pockets, sooner than that the attempt should fail.

EBION ADAMSON.

No doubt he would; he is an excellent man and a true Christian philanthropist; but I trust we shall save ourselves the shame of putting him to so much trouble.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

ART. I.—*Divarication of the New Testament into Doctrine and History*. Part I. The Four Gospels. By T. Wirgman, Esq. Treuttell and Wurtz.

MR. WIRGMAN is a learned expositor of the Kantian philosophy, and has, in the introduction of this book, applied it to Christian Doctrine; with what success we must leave our readers to decide from the following specimen:

"All difficulty which this only perfectly pure notion of the Godhead (the Trinity in Unity) may appear to involve, will be instantly dissipated by attention to the following observations. First, it is absolutely impossible for man to think of *oneness*—it is a complete nonentity, consisting neither of *matter*, *form*, nor *connexion* of these two elements. Hence, when the human mind cogitates, it must think of something. But a thing which is composed neither of *matter* nor *form*

is positively nothing. Consequently the word thing always implies a compound of *three* elements in *one*—a triad of principles, or in fact a TRINITY IN UNITY. Secondly, if we think of a material object, it is quite evident that it must consist of *matter*, or parts which fill up *Space* and occupy *Time*, that is to say, the thing must be an object of experience, and can only be known by its addressing the Senses: for instance, a house, a horse, a tree, and so on. The materials of which the thing consists, as the bricks which compose the house, are the *matter*; the arrangement of these parts of matter constitutes its shape, as round, square, or oval, and is the *form* of the house. But this *form* could not be given to nothing; hence the necessity of the *matter*; and neither of these can be annulled without totally annihilating the thing, with this inseparable condition—that these particular bricks constitute this identical house, with this determined form. So that these *two* elements necessarily imply *connexion*; a *third*, and the three together, constitute the thing called a house. This reasoning applies to the whole of nature, and quite exhausts the entire mundane system, which is composed of an endless series of triads. Now, as *matter* is divisible *ad infinitum*, it must consist of an infinite number of parts; and no *one* part, strictly speaking, can exist by itself, otherwise the division would not be infinite: the least number of parts that can be connected is *two*; but, if these two parts were not connected, there would not be a thing. The elements here are *two* parts, and their *union*, making *three* necessary elements, none of which can be annulled. It is quite obvious that every object of nature which fills up *time* and *space* conforms to this law of a *Trinity in Unity*. Let us carry this parity of reasoning to mental things which exist in *time* only. Thus, all mathematical figures equally conform to this law: take a line for instance; it consists of parts in connexion, and is, in fact, a series of triads; for the smallest possible part of a *mental line* must consist of two mathematical points and their union—a triangle must consist of *three* lines united at three points, yet forming only *one* conception. A circle consists of a centre, periphery, and radius—*three* necessary elements, none of which can be annulled. This law holds with all mental operations, as substance and properties in connexion constitute a thing: Cause, Effect, and the necessary dependence of the one on the other; for that is no cause which has not produced an

effect, and there can be no effect without a cause: so that all mental things obey this law. We have only to ascend one step higher in the scale of reasoning, and carry this notion of a *Trinity in Unity* to the infinite, and the Christian doctrine will be fully displayed.

"Infinite nothingness is a nonentity. Therefore, if the mind of man is to be occupied with a rational thought, it must think of an infinite something; but this must consist of *some* infinite parts, or it would be an infinite nothing. Now the least possible number of infinite parts that can be united is *two*, but, unless these two are connected by a *third*, they could not constitute an infinite something. Hence, even in the infinite, the same process of reasoning is required to constitute a thing, namely, *three* elements united in *one*, or a *Trinity in Unity*.

"Having now satisfactorily accounted for the mystical number *three* in *one*, it only remains to shew that these infinities are *pure* and *holy*, and Christ's theory of the *Trinity* will blaze forth with the effulgence and permanence of truth itself."—Pp. xxii.—xxv.

That the New Testament is divisible into doctrine and history is a tolerably obvious fact; but that "by disencumbering the principles of the Christian Religion from Historical Facts, their universal adoption is facilitated," we more than doubt. If we were obliged to relinquish one of the portions of the New Testament which are here exhibited separately, we should prefer to take that which the Author leaves; inasmuch as there is apostolic authority for regarding the Historical Fact of the resurrection of Christ as the sum and substance of the Gospel.

ART. II.—*Unitarian Christianity suited to make Men Holy. A Discourse delivered at the Ordination of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.* By E. S. Gannett. Boston. 1830.

WE all remember how this preacher was consecrated to his office; how that office was propounded to him; how solemnly and affectionately he was welcomed into it, while its manifold requisitions were exhibited in the noblest perhaps of Channing's pulpit efforts which have been sent over to us. If any have, like ourselves, watched for tokens of the progress of the young minister thus inducted, they will welcome this discourse as a proof that he is worthy of the glory with which he was ushered into notice. It is of the American fraternity; earnest,

simple, true, and through this union of qualities, eloquent. It consists of a statement of Unitarian Christianity, a series of illustrations of its distinctive excellences, and a vindication of it from a few popular charges. It is not, therefore, made to furnish extracts. The readers of Vestry Libraries should see it entire.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

ART. III.—*The Rectory of Valehead.*

By Rev R. W. Evans. Smith and Co., Cornhill. 1830.

THERE is some beauty in this book : beauty in the title, beauty in the frontispiece, and amidst its narrative essays much beauty of description and some of sentiment. But of the theology (which is the chief part) we think very ill. The Christian home here depicted wants, to our apprehension, many of the elements of the most virtuous and happy of homes, and we should have many fears for the judgments and tempers of the young people who were brought up in it, notwithstanding the truth and loveliness of the natural influences which are received into it from the surrounding objects. If the author had read the Bible as he has read Nature, for himself, we should, we imagine, have been indebted to him for a work of much interest and value. We perceive no deficiency, but we regret a perversion of power. These remarks apply to the prose parts alone. Nothing can be said in excuse for the verse.

ART. IV.—*The Sea Kings in England; an Historical Romance of the Time of Alfred.* By the Author of "the Fall of Nineveh."

WE cannot undertake to review novels—neither our limits nor the objects proposed to be accomplished by such a work as the Monthly Repository allow it; but this book has attracted our attention from its connexion with Saxon history. It is the first attempt of the British novelist, we believe, to make use of the materials afforded before the Conquest: and the attempt has some, though very unequal, merit. The first volume altogether displeased us: it seemed a stiff copy of part of Mr. Turner's work, but the author rapidly improves in the second, and in the third he writes with considerable power and spirit. The romance of King Alfred's history is well treated, and the battle scenes are given with much energy. Mr. Atherstone, however, has surely confounded the provinces of the novelist and the historian in his introduction of a

learned discussion on a disputed passage in the life of the great King. It was in his power to *insinuate* his own views of the question, and, if his love of historical controversy would not be so satisfied, to have stated his reasons in a lengthy note; but all discussions of this kind are clearly inadmissible in the body of the work. We take it for granted that an author has settled these things to his own satisfaction, and all we ask from him is to give us the best result he can.

The work contains abundant proofs also that the task of making Saxons talk and act in character is no easy one. The interest we have been hitherto led to feel for them, is too vague a thing for the novelist to lay hold of. We could fancy an interesting volume made up of the adventures of some wild sea king, and whoever has read Thierry's most captivating and pictorial history of the Conquest, will remember traits of nationality, of moral courage, and heroic devotion to a falling cause, which ought to endear the Saxon name to him; but as to the fire-sides and dinner-parties of Saxon Thevns and Ealdermen in the eighth century, we have such vague hints to work upon, that we must either keep to fact, or wholly give the reins to imagination. We have no rich, racy chronicles, no vulgarly prolix statements of the dishes or the discourse. We can only peep into illuminated manuscripts, and, by the *scriptural* illustrations, the dresses, the furniture, and equipments, bestowed upon the personages of the Old and New Testament, learn what were the fashions of the world from which the artist borrowed his ideas. The industrious Strutt has, indeed, made us familiar with all the particulars that could be gleaned respecting manners and customs, dresses and diversions; and the somewhat pedantic Mr. Turner has especially dwelt on the progress of what he is for ever calling "the Saxon mind;" but there is so little life in the pictures given us by either of these worthies, that we feel they are not the authorities which can inspire one who wishes to write the romance of Saxon history. It would be in the highest degree ungrateful to quarrel with Mr. Turner, whose work is decidedly the best connected history of the Anglo-Saxons we have; but yet, we think, the moral and intellectual part of the subject might, in the hands of a more powerful writer, have been given with tenfold effect. To conceive justly and write effectively of the character of Alfred, requires much more than a knowledge of his political

life and his intellectual attainments. We confess that, as the patron of literature, he does not appear to our minds so very engaging as under other aspects. He rather reminds us too much of the zealous lovers of learning among the grandees in the Sandwich Islands. That passionate veneration for words, and that over-strained conception of the good to result from mere acquisition, is very symptomatic of an age just emerging from barbarism. When we think of Alfred, it is the range and compass of his character that we admire. From the scholar, poring over Boethius, we turn to the afflicted man of sorrows, languishing under the pains of an incurable disease, yet rising at every interval of ease with fresh heart and hope, to do good and to communicate. The patience and sweetness which triumphed over the dangers incident to prolonged suffering, are yet less to be admired than the courage, the activity, the energy, by which he appropriated to himself all the fruits of affliction, the opportunity for reflection, the solitary hours of communion with his God, the well meditated and well-digested plan for the improvement of his subjects. Mr. Atherstone has entered into the spirit of this part of King Alfred's character, and no part of his work, probably, will be better liked than the scenes at the Neatherd's. There is, however, a want of finish in the whole: and the occasionally spirited scenes do not sufficiently redeem the work from the charge of general awkwardness and inexperience. He appears too often to be thinking about his materials, and we are led to suppose he would have written better, had he not consulted his few authorities so often, by the superior character of those parts of the narrative in which he has thrown them aside.

ART V.—*The Bereaved, Kenilworth, and other Poems.* By the Rev. E. Whittfield. London, Whittaker, Treacher, and Co. 12mo. pp. 140. 1830.

THE feelings of an amiable mind are here expressed in easy and often flowing numbers.

In *The Bereaved*, which gives its leading title to the volume, and is the longest poem in the collection, the writer describes the workings of conjugal and of parental grief: he represents, too, the comfort which it receives from Christian piety, faith, and hope; even though it be left to mourn in solitude. Some appropriate sentiments are blended with the narrative:

"Why are the lovely called away
So sudden, ere the fleeting day
Of life has reached its noon?
Why ere the fruits in clusters glow,
Or flowers in full luxuriance blow,
Recalled the recent boon?"

"Why do the lovely disappear?
And why the happy fade and die?
Who shall the dubious vision clear?
What hand unveil the mystery?"

Pp. 12, 13.

The appearance of the well-known ruins of a Baronial Castle, and the historical and other associations connected with its picturesque scenery, are sketched in *Kenilworth*.

Of the minor poems, the following "Lines for an Album" are particularly agreeable and pertinent:

"The time is not lost if, on these simple pages,
Some gem of the arts, pleasing treasure be found,
If lays of the muse, and the wit that engages
The heart, spread their charms and their freshness around.

"The blossoms of genius and fancy I gather,
Shall mingle their sweetness, when other blooms fade;
And if trifling they seem, yet be they mine rather
Than pleasures that sting—than pursuits that degrade."—P. 135.

It will be the author's own praise that he has not written a line which in a devotional and moral view "he could wish to blot:" occasionally, he has employed words* that Impartial but Friendly Criticism will be desirous of seeing corrected.

N.

ART VI.—*Life and Reign of George IV.* Vol. I. (Lardner's Cabinet Library, Vol. II.)

WE had occasion last month to speak unfavourably of the first volume of Dr. Lardner's Cabinet Library, in reference to its literary merits; it affords us great pleasure to be able to bestow decided commendation on the volume now before us. Its execution is superior to any of the publications which the late reign has yet called forth; and its spirit is impartial, manly, and uncompromising.

* Such are "acmé," p. 61, "ye," p. 63, &c., in the accusative case, "memorios," p. 62 [for which "memorials" might be advantageously substituted].

MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE.

Books for Sunday Schools.

To the Editor.

32, University Street, London,

February 19, 1831.

SIR,

THE great deficiency of good books for our Sunday-schools has long been felt by all those who are engaged in conducting those useful institutions. When I am travelling about the country, it is my constant practice on the Sunday to go into the school connected with the Unitarian chapel at which I am attending; and the question which universally assails me is, "Can you recommend to us any good reading book?" To this I generally reply by mentioning Mrs. Barbauld's Hymns, Mrs. Mary Hughes's Sunday-Schooler's First Book, Selections from the Old Testament, Turner's Abstract, and the Gospel Examples. "We have all these," it is rejoined; "but we want something else—something in a more popular and attractive form, or, at all events, something which, whether it be good or bad, will have the charm of novelty, for our children are all tired of their old books." Having, therefore, had more leisure than usual this winter, I have been employing it in a very humble, but I trust a well-meant, endeavour to supply the deficiency complained of. I have nearly completed the first part of a set of Bible Stories, which are intended as a reading or class book. To enable your readers to judge of my plan, I subjoin a list of the subjects, and one Story, which may serve as a specimen of the whole.

1. Adam and Eve. 2. Cain and Abel. 3. Noah and the Flood. 4. The Tower of Babel. 5. The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. 6. Abraham and his Son Isaac. 7. Jacob and Esau. 8. Joseph hated by his Brethren. 9. What happened to Joseph in Egypt. 10. Joseph's Conduct to his Brethren and his Father. 11. Moses in the Bulrushes. 12. Destruction of Pharaoh and his Host. 13. The Ten Commandments given. 14. The Tabernacle. 15. The Golden Calf. 16. The Promised Land. 17. Joshua the Leader of the Armies of Israel. 18. Jephtha's Rash Vow. 19. The Feats of Samson. 20. The Story of Ruth. 21. Samuel called to be a Prophet. 22. Saul the First King of Israel. 23. David

slaying Goliath. 24. Friendship of David and Jonathan. 25. Parable of the Ewe Lamb. 26. The Rebellion of Absalom. 27. The Wisdom of Solomon. 28. The Division of the Kingdom. 29. The Three Years' Drought. 30. Elijah and the Priests of Baal. 31. The Wickedness of Ahab and Jezebel. 32. The Young Persons who mocked Elisha. 33. Gehazi struck with Leprosy. 34. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. 35. Nebuchadnezzar eating Grass like Oxen. 36. The Hand-writing on the Wall. 37. Daniel in the Lions' Den. 38. Haman and Mordecai. 39. The Return from the Captivity. 40. Judas Maccabæus.

"16. *The Promised Land.*

"Exodus iii. 8, xxxiii. 1—3; Numbers xiii. xiv.; Deut. xxxiv. 1—6.

"The children of Israel wandered for forty years in the wilderness; and during all this time, they were fed with food from heaven, and their clothes did not grow old, neither did their shoes wear off their feet.

"But God had promised to Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob, that their descendants should possess a land flowing with milk and honey, that is, a very rich and fertile land, and that they should drive out the wicked nations which dwelt there. So when the Israelites arrived on the borders of Canaan, which was the country that had been promised them, Moses chose twelve men, one from each of the tribes; and he sent them to examine the land, to see whether it was as good as they expected. He told them to observe what sort of people dwelt there—whether they were strong or weak, few or many; and whether they dwelt in tents, or in castles; and whether the land was rich or poor, woody or open. He told them also to bring some of the fruits which they found, for it was now the time of the first ripe grapes.

"These men are generally called The Twelve Spies. They went and searched the land as they had been directed; and after forty days they returned, and brought back with them some pomegranates, and figs, and one bunch of grapes so large, that two men were obliged to carry it on a pole between them. This was enough to prove that the land

was fruitful; and Caleb, who was one of those who had seen it, would have had them to go up immediately and take possession of it. But ten out of the twelve spies endeavoured to discourage their countrymen by telling them, that the people who dwelt there were strong, and that they lived in cities with high walls, and that some of them were giants,—and they were sure that they could not overcome them. In short, they gave such a bad account of the land, that the people murmured against Moses and Aaron, and said that they wished that they had died in Egypt, instead of coming up into that miserable desert. Joshua and Caleb tried to make them believe that the land was a good and fruitful land, where it would be pleasant to live, and that they had no need to fear those who dwelt there, for that the Lord would give them the victory; but they would not listen to these good advisers, and took up stones, that they might stone them to death.

"Upon this God was so much displeased, that he declared that none of those who had provoked him so much should ever enter into that beautiful country which he had promised to give to the children of Israel. He declared, that all those who were grown up into men at the time when they came out of Egypt, should die in the wilderness, because they had murmured against him, and had not hearkened to his voice, and that only their children should enter into Canaan. Yet Joshua and Caleb, he said, should enter, because they had behaved well, and had given a good report.

"And it came to pass as God had spoken. Not one of those who were men when they quitted Egypt, entered into the land of Canaan, save only Joshua and Caleb. Moses himself was not allowed to enter; for, though he had been in general a good man, yet he had once or twice offended against God, and had not given to him the glory and the praise which he ought to have done. Yet God permitted him to view the land from the top of Mount Pisgah before he died; and he saw how rich and beautiful a country it was, and how happy and prosperous his brethren would be when they had such a place as that to dwell in.

"God promised to the children of Israel a rich land to live in—a land which should be flowing with milk and honey. And so has he also revealed to us, through Jesus Christ, a still better and happier land, which will be ours, if we do his

will. In that country there will be no hunger, or thirst, or pain; there will be no languor or weariness; and all tears will be wiped away from our eyes. There God will be manifested, and Christ will talk with those who have been his true disciples; and all will be love, and peace, and joy.

"Let us labour then to enter into that blessed land. Let us not think that this earth is better, or that our Heavenly Father will fail of his promise. Let us not murmur and rebel against him, as the children of Israel did; but let us trust in his great goodness, and strive always to do as he has commanded us. Thus shall we have peace at our death, and God will receive us into heaven, where we shall be happy for ever."

But a good reading-book is not the only desideratum in our schools. We want a set of short sermons or addresses, plain, simple, and familiar,—with no metaphysical terms or far-fetched allusions, but accommodated as much as possible to the spiritual wants and the limited capacities of children. If I understand what children need, and what they will comprehend, they must not be told in so many words to "correct their feelings and their habits:"—the man, who speaks thus to children, might as well say *abracadabra* to them, for there is not one in a hundred, under ten years of age, who knows what *feelings* and *habits* mean. If we wish to instruct the young, we must be plain,* and not presume that they understand things which even grown up persons comprehend but imperfectly. The task,

* There is, however, a limit in this respect; and I am by no means disposed to imitate the style of the following passage, taken from a Bible-Story Book, published by Westley and Davis.

"STORY XIX. *More about Jonah, or what he did in the fish's belly.*

"More about Jonah! This is very surprising. One should have thought that, when the fish had swallowed him up, there would have been an end of him. But no, this was not the case. He was alive, though he was in the fish's belly."

It will be observed that I have not placed Jonah in the list of my subjects for stories; I have, in fact, great doubts as to the propriety of introducing him to the acquaintance of children, until some better explanation, or some better version of the passage, be found than what we yet have.

however, is by no means an easy one. "To whom," as you justly observe in your No. for January, p. 48, "shall the office of preaching to our children be intrusted! How easy to the mind of the self-sufficient! To him who has taken a just measure of the difficulty, how arduous!" Notwithstanding the difficulty of the work, I have been led to attempt it; and if I have failed, the public will, I trust, shew some consideration towards one who feels conscious of the inadequacy of his own powers, but who is extremely desirous that some one or other should produce a really good and useable volume of juvenile sermons. I have now written and copied out a set of twenty "Addresses for Sunday Schools, with an appropriate Prayer to each;" and to enable your readers to form some idea of the nature of the work, I subjoin a list of the subjects:

I. The Young Persons who mocked Elisha. II. Humanity to Animals. III. A Perfect Heart better than Riches. IV. The Being of God. V. Explanation of Matthew v. 1—13. VI. Anger. VII. How to keep Sunday holy. VIII. Explanation of Matthew vii. 1—14. IX. Explanation of Matthew vii. 15—29. X. Why we call Jesus Lord. XI. Meaning of the word Gospel. XII. The Tower of Babel. XIII. The Story of Joseph. XIV. The Favour of God better than the Favour of Men. XV. Prayer. XVI. The Providence of God. XVII. God sees us always. XVIII. The Prodigal Son. XIX. What Sort of Books to Read. XX. Easter Sunday.

We have still another want in our Sunday-schools, and that is, of Short Stories or Dialogues, which would serve as prizes or library-books. For these there are some good materials in the books lately published in America. "The Well-spent Hour" is well worth reprinting, and others may probably be found in the same collection equally deserving of attention, or they may be obtained from original sources in England.

Should the public judge favourably of the specimens which I have given above, I shall be very glad to publish the two original works which I have described, as well as one or two prize-books. But next comes the question, Whence are the means to be derived? I know of no bookseller who will undertake them on his own account; and from some experience which I have had in this line, I am certainly not disposed to print them at my own risk, without a previous assurance that I shall be supported by the public. I venture, therefore, through

the medium of your valuable pages, to make an appeal to the Unitarians throughout the country for their support to a scheme which is broached much more with a view to their advantage than from any other consideration whatever. The amount, too, of support which is requested, is, if it come from many, extremely small. Suppose that there are in our connexion one hundred and seventy chapels; (which is, I believe, about the mark;) suppose further, that only one hundred of these have Sunday-schools;—if only fifty will transmit to me an assurance that, upon the publication of the works which I have described, they will each take copies to the gross amount of £1., I shall then have what I shall consider as sufficient encouragement to send my manuscripts to the press. The price, I must add, will be, so far as I can calculate, for the Addresses, 2s. 6d. or 3s. in cloth boards, and for the Bible-Stories, Part the First, 1s. 3d. or 1s. 6d. in cloth boards, or 1s. in a strong cover; and there will, of course, be a considerable deduction from the price when quantities are taken.

Such, Mr. Editor, is the proposal which I have to make. What encouragement it will receive from the public remains now to be seen; but should the appeal which I have made be unanswered, I shall at least have the satisfaction of having filled up a few leisure hours with a most edifying and interesting occupation.

I shall be much obliged by *early* communications from those who may be disposed to patronize my scheme, and remain, yours, &c.,

SAMUEL WOOD.

Extemporaneous Prayer of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, on Laying the Foundation-Stone of the Church at Weston.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THE extemporaneous prayer offered up by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, on laying the foundation-stone for a church to be built on at Weston, and which is here annexed, contains sentiments that are congenial to our feelings as Christians and as men. But how far the Bishop is justified in making that personal address to Jesus Christ which he does in the words of "O most merciful Saviour, Thou who hast promised thy especial presence, &c., &c.," I beg to inquire. Certainly such immediate addresses to Christ may be consistently

made by a *Bishop*, whose church obliges its ministers and clerks often to repeat, "Spare us, good Lord, spare thy people whom *thou hast redeemed* with thy most precious blood, and be not angry with us for ever"—"By the mystery of thy holy incarnation; by thy holy Nativity and Circumcision; by thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation, Good Lord deliver us"—"By thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by thy Cross and Passion; by thy precious Death and Burial; by thy glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, Good Lord deliver us." And most consistently with all this, "That it may please thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with true knowledge and understanding of thy Word." And we may here add our prayer to those of the Church, That thou mayest illuminate our minds with the knowledge of that glorious Being whose attributes are infinite in perfection, who is the object of the highest reverence and worship we can offer. It is a little remarkable that the Bishop of the Church of England, the Wesleyan and Whitfieldite Methodist, the pulpit joking — — and the illiterate Ranter, who goes into the highways to call sinners to repentance, are all agreed in addressing Jesus Christ personally as one in the midst of them, who overlooks their conduct, presents their prayers to the throne of the Most High, as their Mediator and High Priest at their altar of grace, and as their spiritual King, whose laws they profess to obey. How far this may be part and parcel of Christianity, these professors would no doubt take very different courses in proving to the inquisitive. Without producing any proof from Scripture, our bishops and clergy may satisfy themselves in believing the doctrines the church dictates. And the sectarians, with the church, whose views of the doctrines of Christianity are wrapt in the garb of mysticism, may hold out the plea, that Christ, being the second person in the glorious Trinity, is to them a sufficient warrant for this practice in their churches. But there are many Christians, strict Unitarians, who think that many passages of Scripture will bear them out in ascribing blessing and peace, in doing homage to Christ as priest and king over the Christian church in their religious assemblies. It is evident, this worship or homage is, in its nature and degree, distinct from, and subordinate to, that worship which Christians under all systems of belief offer up to the *Almighty—the one Supreme God*

who ruleth over all. And as Unitarians, with all other Christians, are agreed that reverence and love are due to Christ for the blessings he has conferred on mankind, in making known the will of God towards them, a question arises, how far such sentiments may be expressed in prayer on the principles that Unitarians profess? And by the way, is it not evident that the first believers in the Christian church did address Jesus Christ as if he were personally, though invisibly, present in their assemblies? For proof of this, see, in the epistles which were to be read in all the churches, 2 Cor. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Peter iii. 18. For personal worship, see Luke xxiv. 51, 52; Acts vii. 59.

The example of Stephen has often been urged in favour of the personal worship of Christ. Thus they stoned Stephen, who was "calling on and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Or, as it is given in the New Version, "So they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The fitness of this prayer to Christ did not depend upon his being visible to Stephen, but upon Christ's capacity of knowing his petition about his departing soul, and his power to grant the benefit he desired; which all who believe that Christ knows men's thoughts and words, and that he is the disposer of celestial glory and happiness, who, as the Scripture informs us, is ascended into heaven, sitting at the right hand of God, acting as our mediator and friend, and is by God appointed to be our final Judge, must be satisfied would have been the same, though he had been at that time invisible to his faithful and suffering servant. That Jesus Christ hath a perfect knowledge of the affairs, circumstances, and actions of men, though he may not be absolutely acquainted with all that may pass in the universe, may be inferred from the extraordinary powers communicated to him, such as "having all power in heaven and earth"—"Head in all things to the church"—"Lord of all"—"To whom the Father hath committed all judgment, and gave him authority to execute judgment"—"Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do; if ye ask any thing in my name, I will do it"—"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them"—"And all the churches shall know that I am *he* which searcheth the reins and the hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works, even as I received of my Father." All Christians are agreed

that there is no express command in the New Testament that Christians should direct their prayers to Jesus Christ; on the contrary, it is certain that Jesus Christ invariably prayed to his Father as his God, (he could not pray to himself,) and instructed his disciples to do the same; but how far Scripture and the early usage of the Christian Church will bear us out in offering up prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, personally to Jesus Christ, as Head of the Christian Church, as the Mediator of God's appointment, and as his minister in dispensing blessings on his faithful followers, I must leave to the consideration of your readers.

N. G.

Prayer.

"O most merciful God, and merciful Father, who dwellest in the highest heavens, and yet humblest thyself to behold the things that are passing on earth; without whose aid all our wishes are ineffectual, all our endeavours vain: look down, we beseech Thee, upon us thy creatures here assembled before Thee, and prosper this our religious undertaking. Blessed be thy goodness, O Lord! that thou hast put it into the hearts of thy servants to rebuild and enlarge this sanctuary, to the worship and honour of thy great name. May the edifice, of which we have now laid the

foundation, become the blessed means of promoting true religion among us, and extending thy kingdom upon earth; may it, for ages yet unborn, keep alive in the hearts of the inhabitants of this place a due reverence of Thee, and of thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Here may succeeding generations take their place in this thy house, and thus daily proceed in all godliness of living. Hence may the sigh of penitence and the prayer of hope ascend up unto thy throne of grace, and oh! when thou hearest, forgive. When frequenting thy courts with lowliness of devotion and heart, may thy faithful worshipers pass through this earthly temple into the house which is not built with hands, eternal in the heavens. And, O merciful Saviour, thou who hast promised thy especial presence whenever even two or three of thy devout servants are assembled together in thy name, do thou vouchsafe to hear the earnest supplications of thy people, and grant that those which we have asked faithfully according to thy will, we may obtain effectually to thy honour and glory, and to the salvation of our immortal souls.

"Now unto the King eternal, invisible, the only wise God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

Observer Paper, Sept. 13, 1830.

OBITUARY.

REV. GEORGE AUGUSTUS CASE.

1831. January 6, the Rev. GEORGE AUGUSTUS CASE, Minister of the High-Street Chapel in Shrewsbury. He was the son of the Rev. Charles Case, an able Dissenting Minister at Witham, Essex, and was educated at the Academy in Northampton, whence he removed to Shrewsbury, in the year 1797, having been invited to succeed the Rev. Mr. Rowe, upon his removal to Bristol.

He continued to be the sole pastor of his flock until the day of his death, a period of thirty-three years, during the whole of which he lived on terms of perfect harmony with all the members of his congregation. He was an amiable and agreeable man, of a sociable and lively turn of mind, and attached numbers to him by the kindness of his dispo-

sition and the affability of his manners. Compassionate and charitable, he was particularly attentive to the poor, and was ever ready to relieve their wants as far as he had the power. As a preacher he was admired, his sermons being free from bigotry and moroseness, and abounding in liberality and good-will to all men. As a man he was beloved, and his death is sincerely lamented by all who knew him.

February 16, 1831.

MISS MARIA FRY.

Jan 15, after a short illness, at her father's house at *Kidderminster*, Miss MARIA FRY, aged 43 years. In the former part of the last week of December she was in her usual state of health, but she soon after took cold from the severity of

the weather, which brought on a cough that, though troublesome, was not at first considered to be alarming; but it did not as in former instances, yield to medical means. It daily became more violent and enfeebling, and a profuse expectoration followed, which her delicate frame could not long sustain, and in a few days it unhappily terminated her mortal existence. The deceased was from her childhood virtuously and religiously inclined, and the amiableness of her spirit and deportment visibly increased with advancing years. Few have been more free from pride and ostentation, or more discreet and circumspect in general conduct. Being of a diffident and retiring disposition, an intimate acquaintance was necessary to know the excellence of her mind and heart. Her religious views were Unitarian, which induced a conscientious regard to pious as well as moral duties. While she believed that the one God and Father of all is alone the object of devout worship, and delighted in his free mercy and benevolence manifested through Jesus Christ, she found much enjoyment in gratefully commemorating with other Christians the dying love of her Saviour at his table, which she would never neglect except from absolute necessity. The opinions she entertained of revealed truth, and to which she was warmly attached as the true principles of the gospel, afforded her mind a serene consolation in her last illness; and though she affectionately wished, if it so pleased the All-wise Disposer of events, to be spared a little longer for her dear father's sake, she being the last remaining of his beloved offspring, yet she was eminently patient, and most calmly resigned to the Divine Will, always saying, when asked how she felt, that her mind was very comfortable. Almost the last words she was distinctly heard to utter, a short time before she expired, were, "The will of the Lord be done!" During her life she was a truly kind-hearted and dutiful daughter, and her loss is severely felt and greatly bewailed; but the sorrow thus occasioned by death is not without the hope of a blessed resurrection, and a happy meeting again in a sinless and immortal state, the influence of which may well promote the Christian duty of humble submission to the will of God, under this trying and inscrutable dispensation of his providence.

MRS. WOOD.

Feb. 2, Mrs. Wood, wife of Mr. Samuel Wood, of Bedford Street, Chorlton

Row, Manchester;—an affectionate parent, a tender and beloved wife, a valuable friend, and an ornament to society; endeared by her many virtues to him who would thus attempt to perpetuate their remembrance. She bore a long sickness with patience and resignation, and all the reverses of life with cheerfulness and composure. She had lived to bring up a large and affectionate family with honour and credit, and her latter days were comforted by their kindness and solicitude. Her character was distinguished by the virtues that adorn domestic life, and in the education of her children she strictly followed the injunction to "train them up in the way they should go," under the impression that "when they were old they would not depart from it." What is often attempted by harshness and severity, she accomplished by mildness and forbearance, and taught her family, by her own example, the value and comfort of a religious and well-governed life. She loved not the bustle and gaieties of the world, but sought in the bosom of her family and connexions those comforts and enjoyments which many vainly seek for abroad. By her own fire-side she delighted to spend the evening hour with her family and friends. Here it was that she shewed the mildness and amiableness of her temper, and delighted to share her own joys and sorrows with those of others, and to discourse with them of what has already become her own lot, and what must ultimately be the lot of all. Here she delivered those lessons of prudence and kindness which were intended to influence the feelings and conduct of those whose happiness she identified with her own. May these lessons be treasured up in the hearts of those who are now mourning her loss, and may the recollection of her worth stimulate them to follow her example!

She lived and died an Unitarian Christian, with full reliance on the mercy and paternal character of the Father, and on the gracious promises made known to us by his Son. Her latter days were marked by no unholy enthusiasm, and no indulgence of an excited imagination. Her countenance indicated that inward peace and serenity of mind which the world can neither give nor take away.

The sorrow which such a loss has occasioned, is alleviated by the recollection that departed worth will meet with its reward, and that the glorious resurrection of the Saviour holds out to his pure and devoted followers the joyful hope, that, when this life is ended, they shall

partake of that blessedness which he is now sharing with the Father in heaven.

R.

Manchester, Feb. 15, 1831.

REV. JOHN HINCKS.

Feb. 5, in the 27th year of his age, the Rev. JOHN HINCKS, minister of the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, Liverpool. Mr. Hincks was a native of Ireland, son of the Rev. Thomas Dix Hincks, Professor of Hebrew and Classical Master in the Belfast Institution, and brother to the Rev. William Hincks, Mathematical Tutor at York College, whom he succeeded in his pastoral charge. The early part of his professional education was passed in Trinity College, Dublin, but his strong principles of dissent, and his love of every thing liberal, induced him to connect himself with a more unshackled, though an infant seminary, and his final preparation for the ministry was made in the classes of the Belfast Academical Institution. In the February of 1827, he left his home and his associates, afflicted at the thoughts of even a temporary separation, to form new friendships, even holier connexions and dearer ties, to make a place for himself in the best affections of many hearts; and thus by his early death to send abroad the anguish of a wider bereavement. In the August of the same year he entered on his pastoral duties in Liverpool, and from his mourning church, every individual of which is sorrowing as though stricken with a personal calamity, the memory of his pious spirit, of his gentle meekness, of his holy and devoted zeal, can never pass away. He lived long enough to be known, to be loved, to be revered, to shew us the brightness of a Christian's example, and he then passed to a happier and a more congenial world. *His* was not a character that required length of days to perfect; he passed through life with an infant's purity; and when he had left on earth some traces of himself, and shined into other hearts with some light from the beamings of his own lofty and glowing mind, God removed him gently to that land where it is more fitting that spirits such as his should dwell.

It was impossible to know him, or even to be in his company, without being impressed, and to those whose religious sensibilities were such as to admit of it, almost overawed, by the singular purity of his mind. He seemed to live as if he were scarcely aware that there are such

things as guilt and pollution in the world, or, at least, as if he himself were placed so far above them, that he did not *feel* their existence. This sacredness of character, in one so young, was truly wonderful, and in the deep fervency of his youthful piety there was felt to be something alike awful and beautiful. There was an apostolic simplicity and truth in every thing he did, a dignified gracefulness of deportment, which even in the intimacies of a confiding friendship and the fondness of domestic life, though he was the gentlest and the most affectionate of human beings, never deserted him. There was a holiness of feeling, and a bloom on the soul, which he would not suffer to be brushed away. This sanctity of mind, united to a perfect humility, exhibited one of those beautiful contrasts of character which are formed on the model of Jesus Christ. Indeed, we knew not the being on earth so worthy to take up the triumphant language of his Master, and to say to weeping friends, "If you loved me, you would rejoice, because I go to the Father." He possessed the same *cast* of excellence which we admire in the Saviour. He was of the meekness and of the gentleness of Christ, of the same breathing, seraphic piety, of the same calmness and unassuming dignity.

As a preacher he was distinguished by his fervour, by a sweet and most persuasive eloquence, by a remarkable beauty and justness of sentiment, and by a perfect chasteness both of thought and of expression. His whole soul was on his lips, and it was felt even by the most indifferent auditor, that he was breathing out the very truth of his heart. And yet his devotional services are perhaps that part of his public ministrations which will live longest in the hearts they have comforted and quickened, and, we trust, purified. He prayed as one who felt that he was with God, and who had realized to his own soul the invisible object of his holy meditations. There was an irresistible power in his prayers to still the restlessness of the mind, to fix it on heavenly thoughts, and to breathe over it the holy peace of a devotional spirit.

One of the most affecting circumstances in this lamented death is the sudden rupture of sweet links, which were but just fastened. He had been married scarcely seven months.

"And that pure spirit found a breast,
On which his own in trust might rest;
And visions of home-felt delight
Around him threw their angel light."

And "visions" they were only to be, for God had prepared for him a purer happiness with himself.

"The mandate came; in that bright day
It came, and he was called away
From love, from friendship, and from
life;
He passed, nor felt the painful strife.
Oh! they were dear, but dearer still
To him, was his Creator's will.

"The glories which through life had
shone
In every scene, to guide him on,
Came with their pure, immortal glow,
To shine upon his dying brow;
And the deep grateful love he bore
His God, sustained him in that hour—
He passed in calmness and in faith."

Nothing can express more fully than do these beautiful words the very character of his soul, and the perfect serenity of his death. He died as he lived, peacefully, gently, calmly.

It is the finest triumph of a religious faith that the darkest hour of earthly sorrow is that in which it puts forth its brightest and most glowing light. The grave is its place of glory; in the bitterness of woe its most triumphant hopes are realized, and in the heart which is desolated of its human affections it erects its promised heaven. It is one of the surpassing mercies of a gracious God, that from the sorest struggles of the spirit are wrought out the holiest aspirations and the most glorious exhibitions of our nature; that out of the heaviest trials of humanity there issues the glory of a spiritual victory; that weakness is the forerunner of strength; that death is wedded to immortality. It is this thought which has power to comfort the mourner, and, when nature has shed her tears, to kindle in that heart which is now full of sorrow the lustre of an eter-

nal hope.—Thanks be to God who hath given us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ!

Hymn written on occasion of the Death of the Rev. John Hincks, and sung after the Funeral Sermon, at the Chapel in Renshaw Street, Liverpool, on Sunday Morning, the 13th of February, 1831.

"He being dead yet speaketh."—Heb. xi. 4.

Hark! Christians, to the tones that fill
Each listening mourner's ear,
"He being dead yet speaketh still,"
His voice is hovering near.

O listen now, tho' once the sound
Might coldly touch thy breast;
Those gentle accents float around
From mansions of the blest.

They speak to youth in warning strain
To shun temptation's way,
Nor venture 'midst the pleasures vain
Of Life's delusive day.

They speak to those in manhood's pride
As they were wont to speak,
To lay their worldly trust aside,
And better riches seek.

And gently to the infant band
They tell of heavenly things,
And speak of that enduring land
Where endless pleasure springs.

And to the Christian bent with years
They breathe in words of love,
And bid him lay aside his fears
And find his rest above.

O not in vain his death shall be
Whose life so brightly shone,
For "being dead yet speaketh he,"
In accents all his own.

So tho' we ne'er shall see him more
Within this hallowed Fane,
Yet let us live his virtues o'er,
Nor make his labours vain.

INTELLIGENCE.

Report of the Committee of Deputies of the Protestant Dissenters to the General Meeting.

THE proceedings of your Committee during the past year, although relating to subjects of great importance, will not, it is apprehended, be deemed to possess in themselves very deep interest, compared,

as they can hardly fail to be, with the successful efforts of your Committee in the cause of Religious Liberty in the two preceding years.

In the early part of the present year, the attention of your Committee was called to another of those obnoxious Acts of the Assembly of Jamaica, by which restraints were laid upon the Religious

Instruction of Slaves, and their exercise of Divine Worship, amounting nearly to a total prohibition. Your Committee, upon that occasion, thought it expedient to print, for the purpose of circulation, extracts from the proceedings of this Deputation in the years 1802, 1804, 1807, 1808, and 1826, when similar attempts were made to infringe the rights of conscience; and, as this subject is intimately connected with the great question of the abolition of slavery, which now occupies so large a share of public attention, your Committee have annexed those extracts to the present Report.

The Act against which the attention of your Committee was last directed, was passed by the Assembly of Jamaica, in December, 1829, and was even more oppressive than that sent over and disallowed in 1826. It denounced as unlawful, all Meetings for Religious Worship, between six o'clock in the evening and six in the morning, and prohibited the slaves from teaching one another, and Dissenting Teachers from receiving any pecuniary aid from slaves.

Your Committee had frequent communications with the Wesleyan and Baptist Missionary Societies on this subject, and then appointed a Deputation to wait on Sir George Murray, (the late Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs,) for the purpose of remonstrating against the allowance of the Act passed last December. And your Committee have the satisfaction of stating, that the result proved (as in all former instances) fully equal to their wishes; the Act in question having been disallowed by His Majesty in Council, immediately on its being officially received.

The total abolition of slavery throughout the British Dominions, is another subject which has come under the notice of your Committee. It will, no doubt, be in the recollection of the Deputation, that, at the general meeting of Deputies, in May last, several resolutions were passed, expressive of their anxiety for the abolition of the inhuman system of Slavery, and strongly recommending to the various congregations of Protestant Dissenters in the United Kingdom, to petition Parliament for the speedy accomplishment of that object; publicity was given to those resolutions through the medium of several religious periodical publications. This deputation at the same time resolved to present petitions from themselves as a body. Those petitions were, accordingly, immediately afterwards presented, in which it was prayed, as one of the most effectual measures for abolishing

slavery, that "all the children who should be born after an early day, to be appointed by Parliament, should be declared free, and be effectually protected from any claims that might be made to them as slaves."

Your Committee have also had the pleasure of communicating with the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society, who, it is well known, have been for a long time past, and still are, making great exertions for the accomplishment of the great object of the "total abolition of slavery." Your Committee rejoice to observe the universal feeling that now pervades the United Kingdom, and has caused an unprecedented number of petitions to be presented to the Legislature for the same object; and when, in addition to these favourable circumstances, it is borne in mind that several of the noble and right-honourable individuals now at the head of public affairs have upheld this cause of righteousness and mercy, with their most valuable support, the friends of religion and humanity may reasonably entertain a hope that their wishes will, at no very distant period, be realized.

Upon the late accession of King William IV. to the throne, your Committee (according to ancient usage) invited the Deputies, as a body, to present an address of congratulation to his Majesty, expressive of their attachment to his illustrious house, under the peculiar impressions of Protestant Dissenters, looking back with affectionate gratitude to the two preceding reigns, in which our hopes and wishes for the extension of religious liberty have been gratified in a very signal and unexampled degree. The Deputies, accordingly, at a Special General Meeting, on the 30th July last, agreed to such an address, and the same having been immediately afterwards laid before his Majesty by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, your Committee were in due course informed that his Majesty received it in the most gracious manner.

In the last year's Report it was mentioned, that the sub-committees appointed to act with respect to a general plan of registration of births, marriages, and deaths, had been in communication with the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the laws of real property. At a general meeting, held on the 29th of May, 1829, it was resolved to postpone any application to Parliament relative to registration, until those Commissioners had made their report; and your Committee are still of opinion, that it is better

to wait the result of the Commissioners' proceedings, rather than attempt any separate measure on the subject.

With respect to the marriage law, so far as it affects Protestant Dissenters, your Committee have invited the assistance and co-operation of the Committee of the Protestant Society, in order to devise the most expedient measures to be adopted. That society has appointed a deputation to meet a deputation from your Committee, and a meeting is intended to take place forthwith.

In May last, the attention of your Committee was called to a bill then pending in Parliament, for regulating the free grammar school at Birmingham. A clause had been introduced into that bill, tending to exclude Dissenters from any share in the controul or management of the school, or its funds; a circumstance which could not fail to excite the attention of the Dissenters of Birmingham, who are a very numerous and influential body in that town. They accordingly, without delay, appointed a committee to oppose the objectionable clause, considering, no doubt, as well as your Committee, the attempt as a fresh exhibition of the same spirit of bigotry which had occasioned, for so long a period, the continuance of the Corporation and Test Acts upon our statute book. Your Committee, therefore, communicated with the Birmingham Committee on the subject, and shortly afterwards the bill dropped, on the third reading in the House of Lords, where it originated.

Your Committee have still to lament the little effect produced by their address, forwarded near two years ago to Dissenting congregations throughout the kingdom, on the subject of the funds of the deputation. They had flattered themselves that the statements contained in that address, and the appeal therein made to the justice and liberality of Dissenters at large, would have had the desired effect, of not only replenishing the finances of the deputation, after the heavy reduction they had experienced by the expenses of obtaining the repeal of the Sacramental Test, but also of establishing a further permanent fund, from which a sufficient income might be derived for the ordinary purposes of the deputation, and to the principal of which resort might be had in case of any other great and unforeseen emergency. Your Committee, however, so far from having their expectations realized, have had the mortification to find that the amount of subscriptions, collected in consequence of the address, is very little more than

sufficient to defray the actual expenses of its circulation. To what cause this extraordinary indifference is to be attributed, your Committee are at a loss to conceive; but they are willing to put the most favourable construction they can upon the conduct of the Dissenters, by supposing that they consider a large fund unnecessary, now that the repeal of the Sacramental Test has been effected. Your Committee the more deeply lament the unfavourable issue of their exertions, as that which yet remains to be done for the cause of civil and religious liberty may give rise to considerable expense, whilst the want of available funds to defray it may occasion great difficulty, delay, and embarrassment.

As to the ordinary business of the past year, your Committee have the pleasure to state, that but few instances have occurred requiring their interference. The following is a brief statement of the cases brought before them:—

1. A poor minister in Wales was deprived of an endowment, consisting of the rents of several houses, which had been bequeathed by a will made in the year 1735, for the benefit of the minister, for the time being, of a particular congregation. The endowment was regularly accounted for, and paid to the ministers, in succession, for a great number of years; but at length the trustees withheld payment from the present minister, alleging that they had a discretionary power to appropriate the endowment to some other minister in the neighbourhood. The opinion of counsel was taken, and being in favour of the claimant, every means was used to induce the trustees to comply with the donor's intention, but without effect. A petition to the Lord Chancellor was, therefore, presented, which for some time was obstinately resisted by the trustees; but at length they yielded to the justice of the case, delivered possession to the minister, accounted for the rents they had received, and executed a conveyance of the estate to new trustees for the benefit of the claimant and his successors, so as to preclude the possibility of any doubt or dispute on the subject hereafter.

2. Another minister in Wales was ejected from his meeting-house and dwelling house, by an action at the suit of the heir-at-law of the surviving trustee. The case was not brought before your Committee till within a few days of the trial; when, seeing it was one of great hardship, and strongly recommended to the attention of your Committee by many respectable ministers in Wales, they re-

solved to undertake the conduct of it to a certain extent. They, accordingly, under the advice of counsel, defended and adopted proceedings in the Court of King's Bench, and in the Common Law and Equity Courts of Wales, in the hope of getting the minister reinstated in his office, and restored to his rights; but in the progress of the suit they found it encompassed with so many difficulties, and that so much doubt arose in the minds of counsel as to its final success, that they have found it expedient to withdraw from further interference.

3. The third and last case is, that of a recent disturbance of worship at the chapel in Great Suffolk Street, Southwark. Your Committee were applied to to prosecute the offender, but, upon his coming forward and signing a written apology, expressing contrition for his offence, and promising never to repeat it, they deemed it expedient to forbear a prosecution. The same course has been adopted in former instances of this kind, and your Committee hope that their act of justice on this occasion will not prove less beneficial by being tempered with mercy.

ROBERT WINTER,
Secretary.

16, Bedford Row.

Hull Unitarian Sunday-School Anniversary.

On Sunday, January 16th, the annual sermon was preached on behalf of this school, by the Rev. R. K. Philp, of Lincoln, from Eccl. xi. 6, "In the morning sow thy seed," &c. On the following Tuesday afternoon the children of the school, after singing a hymn, and hearing a suitable address, and joining in prayer in the chapel, were conducted to a room hired for the purpose, where tea was prepared and served to them by their teachers. They sang another hymn before they were dismissed. A second tea party sat down afterwards to the same table, consisting of the teachers and friends of the Sunday-school and the congregation, to the number of seventy-four, which number was afterwards increased by other arrivals, and by the addition of the older scholars, who were admitted at their own desire. Mr. Philp kindly acted as Chairman after tea; and the evening was delightfully spent in friendly social intercourse, and in listening to various addresses from several speakers on subjects of religious and benevolent interest. The meeting concluded with singing and prayer.

This was the second meeting of the kind by which the society here have commemorated their school anniversary; and it is intended to hold it in a similar manner in future years.

Hull, Jan. 20, 1831.

E. H.

Lectures at the Octagon Chapel, Norwich.

LECTURES on the principles of Unitarianism having been recently delivered at the Octagon Chapel, by the Rev. W. J. Bakewell, to numerous congregations, who were forcibly impressed by the powerful reasonings and eloquent appeals of their minister, a subscription was set on foot to present to the Rev. Gentleman a testimonial of their admiration and esteem.

Although the amount of individual subscriptions was purposely limited to a mere trifle, a sum of thirty pounds was speedily collected, and presented by a deputation of the congregation to Mr. Bakewell, who was much affected by this unexpected testimony of the sentiments of his flock.

It is understood that the effect produced by these lectures on persons not hitherto connected with the chapel, has encouraged Mr. B. to prepare a second series. May they open the eyes of those hitherto blind to the absurdities of Trinitarianism.

R. M.

Church Revenues.

THE following statement of the revenues of the Church of England and Wales, is furnished in "The Extraordinary Black Book," just published by Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange:—

Church Tithe	£6,884,800
Incomes of the Bishoprics ..	397,115
Estates of the Deans and Chapters	494,000
Glebes and Parsonage Houses	250,000
Perpetual Curacies, 75 <i>l.</i> each	75,000
Benefices, not Parochial, 250 <i>l.</i> each.. ..	32,450
Church Fees, or Burials, Marriages, Christenings, &c.	500,000
Oblations, Offerings, and Compositions for Offerings at the Four Great Festivals..	80,000
College and School Foundations	602,150
Lectureships in Towns and Populous Places	60,000
Chaplainships and Offices in Public Institutions	10,000
New Churches and Chapels	94,050
	<hr/>
	£9,479,565

From the same authority, we learn that "the number of prelates, dignitaries, and incumbents, is only 7,694; and if the above were equally divided among them, each would receive one thousand two hundred and twenty eight pounds per annum. The number of benefices is, however, 11,342. There are 5,098 rectories, 3,687 vicarages, and 2,970 churches, neither rectorial nor vicarial, making a total of 11,755 churches. These churches are contained in 10,674 parishes and parochial chapelries. The whole of these 10,674 benefices are in the hands of 7,191 incumbents; there are 2,886 individuals with 7,037 livings; 567 with 1,701 livings; 209 with 836 livings; 64 with 320 livings."

We do not pretend to decide between this statement and the following, but the Church has no right to complain of misrepresentation, or to claim credence, while the materials for a correct estimate are withheld from the public.

NON-RESIDENT CLERGY.—Lord KING brought forward a motion on this subject on Monday, Feb. 14. His Lordship's object was to shew the ratio between the non residents of parishes where the patronage was in the hands of laymen, and of parishes where it was in the hands of Churchmen. The usual plea for pluralities, the grand cause of non-residence, was, that the livings, separately taken, were too poor to support a clergyman; but Lord King observed, this plea could be urged only where all the livings held by a pluralist were poor ones. The average income of the clergy of England had been stated to be 365*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.*: he thought the proper rule would be, that where any living was of equal or greater value than that average, the incumbent should not be permitted to hold another. The Church, Lord King said, was by no means liberal to her own sons. On some Church property belonging to the see of York, the sums paid to the clergymen were not more than 30*l.* a year: in one case of a valuable college living worth 2000*l.* the curate received only 30*l.*, and the parishioners had been obliged to subscribe to make it up to 70*l.*

The Bishop of LONDON said, since he last addressed their Lordships on the subject, he had entered into a calculation of the average income of the clergy; and he found, if the whole of the income of the Church was equally divided among the various incumbents in England and Wales, it would not exceed 155*l.* each; and even adding the glebe lands, Queen Anne's bounty, and property of the va-

rious Deans and Chapters, it would not exceed 200*l.*; while the average income of the Church of Scotland amounted at the least calculation to 275*l.* The publications on this subject were a tissue of the grossest misrepresentations.

Proceedings in Jamaica.

[From the Anti-Slavery Reporter.]

WE have received a great mass of information from various slave colonies, but principally from Jamaica, since the last Reporter was published. We can only glance at a few of the points which it embraces.

The Assembly of Jamaica, in their displeasure with the Government for having rejected the Slave Act of 1829, with its anti-christian clauses, have resolved to take no step whatever to amend their slave law. That of 1829 was proposed to be re-enacted in its former state, with the exclusion simply of its persecuting provisions; but after long debates, which displayed not only an extraordinary degree of heat and asperity, but gross ignorance of all constitutional principles, and the most determined hostility to all missionary efforts, it was thrown out by a majority of 24 to 16. The Assembly are thus fairly at issue with the Government and Parliament of this country. They seem to have felt the perilousness of placing themselves in such a predicament; having on one side a numerous population of slaves, possibly excited by the failure of all hope of seeing their condition alleviated; and on the other, the free black and coloured classes generally irritated by the contemptuous rejection of their claims to equal rights, and openly proclaiming their willingness to accede to the wishes of Government on the subject of slavery; and they could not, therefore, but be alarmed at the prospect of standing alone in a conflict with the Government, and also with both the free black and coloured classes, and the slaves. It appears to be under some such impression that, in despite of all their ancient and most inveterate prejudices, they have carried through all its stages, with unusual celerity, a bill for conferring on all free black and coloured persons the same privileges, civil and political, with the white inhabitants. This measure, we have no doubt, will prove in its consequences a most auspicious one, whatever may have been its motive. The free classes are too strong in their allegiance to be drawn in to join the whites in a contumacious resistance to

the Government, and therefore this precipitate change of policy cannot but prove highly beneficial in its results to the general interests of humanity. The Assembly have offered, it is true, a high bribe to the black and coloured classes, by removing all their disabilities; but we think they have formed a most mistaken estimate of those classes if they expect their support in any measures of resistance to the Government and Parliament of this country. Their passions, we are persuaded, have here deluded them. We nevertheless rejoice exceedingly in the event.

The Assembly appear greatly alarmed also by the freedom with which the periodical press of the island, and particularly the Watchman and the Christian Record, canvas the conduct of the planters, and the nature and effects of slavery, and a bill has been brought in to restrain it, which has excited very general opposition, particularly on the part of the free black and coloured people. The bill proposes to give summary power to magistrates to enter printing-houses and seize types, papers, &c.; and it inflicts on any one convicted of publishing seditious libels, the punishment of transportation for life. Should such a law pass in the island, it could only live until it reached England, where it must of necessity be disallowed.

The House of Assembly was suddenly and unexpectedly prorogued by the Governor, probably to give them time to reflect calmly on their peremptory rejection of all improvement in their slave code.

Messrs. Lecesne and Escoffery, whose names and whose sufferings are familiar to our readers, had returned to Jamaica, after an exile of seven long years, and after having received the redress they had sought from the justice of this country, for the cruel injuries they had sustained from the government of Jamaica. Their return was hailed with the utmost joy by the free black and coloured inhabitants.

Unitarianism in Guernsey.

SIR,

A LETTER in your Repository for February last, (under the head of "Unitarianism in Guernsey," signed "E. Whitfield," and dated "Ilminster," interested me so much, that I entered into a correspondence with the subject of it, which, ultimately, led to their sending me the inclosed. If it appears to you, as it does to me, that the publication of

it in your Repository may, eventually, prove serviceable to their interests, as well as an encouragement to others under similar circumstances, it is at your service.

C. H.

One of our members had been for several years a class leader and local preacher in the Wesleyan Methodist connexion in England; he had, for some considerable time, held opinions that were not in strict accordance with those of his Methodist friends, particularly on the subject of future punishment, the eternal duration of which he could not admit, not being able to reconcile the doctrine of eternal punishment with the acknowledged perfections of God, and the general tenor of divine revelation. His views on this subject were generally known among the preachers and people; among the latter there were many who thought *with him*; they spake often one to another on this and other interesting subjects, and he continued united with them in Christian love and friendship during his stay among them. On his removal to the island of Guernsey, having received an appointment in the service of the customs, it so happened that, in attending the Methodist chapel, he found one of the travelling preachers on the station to whom *he was well known*; this man was a strenuous advocate for the doctrine of Eternal Punishment; and although he was apparently very friendly, he secretly insinuated among the people that *such an one was not sound in the faith*, that he held dangerous opinions, and that it would be advisable that the people should have as little intercourse with him as possible. This had its intended effect with regard to the greater part of the members, but it excited the attention of others in a more excellent way; these manifested a friendly disposition towards the stranger, and sought opportunities to *converse with him on the subject of religion, &c.*

It was on one of these occasions, when three of his Christian friends spent the evening with him at his house, that they expressed themselves as highly gratified with the evening's conversation; and one of them proposed a *stated* weekly meeting for the purpose of religious conversation, &c. The proposal was gladly embraced, and from that time I date the origin of the Unitarian Church in Guernsey; not that either of us had *any idea of Unitarianism at that time*; we had scarcely heard of the name, and were al-

together *unacquainted* with the doctrine, and *unconnected* with its professors.

Our first subject was God's Universal Love—to us a most delightful theme. The gracious declarations with which the Scriptures abound on this subject, became familiar to us; on *this* subject we delighted to dwell; it excited in our hearts sentiments of the purest gratitude, and furnished us with the most powerful motives *to love and fear God, and walk in his way.*

Among other arguments to prove the universality of God's love to mankind, we laid *no small stress* upon what we had been taught to believe as the doctrine of atonement, that the justice of God had been satisfied for the sins of mankind by the sufferings and death of Christ, that he had not only paid a debt, but had also purchased salvation for us. Such were the ideas which pervaded every part of our religious services, *to which we had been accustomed for years*; we had been taught to sing repeatedly,

"Lord, I believe were sinners more
Than sands upon the ocean shore,
Thou hast for *all* a ransom paid,
For *all* a full atonement made."

"For all my Lord was crucified,
For all, for all, my Saviour died,
His blood atoned for all our race,
And sprinkles now the throne of
grace."

"Behold the Lamb of God who bears
The sins of *all the world* away," &c.

The reiteration of the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, (commonly a more harsh expression,) which sounded in our ears in almost every sermon, appeared to us so inconsistent with our hymns, and so contradictory to the positive declaration of the Almighty, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made," Isaiah lvii. 16, that it excited our astonishment, and led us to a more particular consideration of the subject, than, perhaps, we otherwise should have given it, until we came at length to perceive that the doctrine of Atonement, *as we had been taught*, was not only inconsistent with eternal punishment, but incompatible *with any punishment at all*; for it now appeared to us, that if full satisfaction has been made to Divine Justice for the sins of mankind, and if the whole world be *included in that* satisfaction as stated above, then in *that* case, it struck us forcibly, there could be no future pu-

nishment for sin. We were not prepared for this conclusion. We were, I may say, alarmed at the result of our discussions on this subject; we saw clearly that the salvation which the gospel reveals is *conditional*; that repentance, faith, and good works, are essentially necessary to our final acceptance with God; and that our state and condition in a future world depends upon our conduct in this. We now believed that God sent his Son *not to satisfy his justice by paying the sinner's debt*, but to bless mankind by turning them from their iniquities; that obedience to his precepts and conformity to his example is the best proof we can give of our love to Christ, and *we determined accordingly.*

About this time, reading in "Evans's Sketch," we found a reference to a book called the "Antisatisfactionist;" this we immediately procured; it was to us a most valuable acquisition, and confirmed us in our change of opinion on the doctrine of Atonement. We next ventured to discuss what we had been taught to believe as the divinity of Christ, that it was essential to the satisfaction required for the sins of mankind, that Christ should *be God* as well as man, otherwise it could not be an infinite satisfaction. The following is the language of our hymns in reference to this subject.

"Equal with God most high,
He laid his glory by,
He, the Eternal God was born!"

"God, in this dark vale of tears,
A man of griefs was seen;
Here, for three and thirty years,
He dwelt with sinful men."

Then he dies.

"Come see, ye worms, *your Maker* die!
And say was ever grief like his."

And again,

"The *Immortal* God hath died for me."

We now perceived the impropriety of such language, and having given up the doctrine of satisfaction, the argument for the Deity of Christ, arising from the supposed necessity of an infinite satisfaction, lost all its force, and we soon came to the conclusion, that as there is but one God, and that one God is so clearly distinguished in scripture as a *distinct* being from Jesus Christ, as having sent him, anointed him, raised him from the dead, &c., &c., that Jesus Christ could not be God in the strict and proper sense of the word.

Our friends now began to feel dissa-

tified in attending public worship at those places where they were under the necessity of hearing many things which they could not approve; and being firmly persuaded, from a careful attention to the Holy Scriptures, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only proper object of religious worship, it was finally agreed, that we should meet together at the house of one of our friends on the Lord's-day, for the purpose of uniting in the worship of God, in what appeared to us a more scriptural way than we could find elsewhere.

We now began to feel some inconvenience from the want of proper hymns to assist us in singing the praises of God; those to which we had been hitherto accustomed now appeared to us as highly *exceptionable*. We had heard of Mr. Aspland, as the respectable Editor of the Monthly Repository, and took the liberty of writing to him for his advice respecting a Hymn Book. He, in the most obliging manner, replied to our request; and having subsequently had an opportunity of seeing his "Selection of Psalms and Hymns for Unitarian Worship," it met with our mutual approbation; we accordingly sent for a few copies, and Mr. Aspland had the goodness to send with them a present of various Unitarian publications, including several copies of his own published Sermons, which was to us a most valuable acquisition, not only confirming us in the belief of the truth as far as we understood it, but also as it *increased* our means of information. We shall ever feel a grateful remembrance of this kindness, and also his further kindness towards us shortly afterwards, in procuring for us a donation of books from the Unitarian Society, which were transmitted to us by Dr. Rees, the Secretary, who kindly added to them some of his own Tracts.

Our meeting for worship was at first rather of a private nature than otherwise. We met together for singing, and prayer, and reading the Scriptures. The brethren in turn also read a sermon. We had, however, excited public attention, and soon had occasional visitors at our meetings, until at length circumstances appeared favourable to our opening a place of worship in a more public way. We therefore thought it expedient to form ourselves into something like church order, and mutually pledged each other in the fear of God and as the disciples of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to submit to certain regulations, *unanimously* adopted for our church government, discipline, &c., which was inserted in a book, (which

we call the church book,) to which we all signed our names, and solemnly engaged to walk so as to please God, by carefully guarding against *every thing* which we know to be contrary to his revealed will, and, by a conscientious discharge of moral and religious duties, to maintain consciences void of offence towards God and man.

We then had a room fitted up for the public worship of the *only true God*, in the name and as the disciples of Jesus Christ, whom he had sent. We also commenced preaching twice on the Lord's-day, which we still continue; our congregations have never been large, but they have been in general regular, from five-and twenty to thirty, upon an average, and seldom more. It is now something more than nine years ago the Guernsey Unitarian Church was formed; and having obtained help of God we continued to this day; our present prospects are *not very cheering*—the disadvantages under which we labour are well described by our excellent friend Mr. Whitfield in the Monthly Repository. As you have seen this, there is the less necessity of my entering into a more circumstantial account in regard to *this* particular. I pray God to continue his goodness towards us, *by keeping us in the right way*, that we may stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel.

Locke's Monument.

On Wednesday, Feb. 9th, a Meeting of the Subscribers to a Fund for the erection of a Monument to John Locke, was held at the Freemasons' Tavern. The subscription for the undertaking commenced in the year 1808, when a small sum was collected. In 1816 the amount in hand was 455*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*, which was invested in the Funds, and, with the accumulations, now amounts to 846*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.* In consequence of the large sums demanded for fees, the Monument could not be erected in St. Paul's Cathedral or Westminster Abbey; and it was therefore proposed that it should be placed in the Hall of the London University, to which it was stated there would be no objection. The Monument is to be similar to that of Lord Erskine, in Lincoln's Inn Hall, the expense of which was 1200*l.* Mr. Westmacott is the artist. The subscription has been augmented by a donation of 100*l.* from Lord King, the faithful biographer of the great metaphysician.

Polish Jews.

THE JEWS are at this moment taking a very active part in the Polish Revolution. They are publishing at Warsaw a newspaper in Hebrew, of which we have seen several numbers in Paris. — *Le Globe.*

NOTICES.

A MEETING of the Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association will be holden at Ilminster, on Good Friday, April 1. The Rev. Robert Cree, of Bridport, is expected to preach in the morning, and the Rev. W. S. Brown, of Bridgewater, in the evening. The business of the Association will be transacted immediately after the morning service, and a full attendance of the subscribers and friends is particularly desired.

E. W., Sec.

THE Half yearly Meeting of the Hull, East York, and North Lincolnshire Unitarian Association, will be held at Lincoln, on Friday the 1st of April; when the Rev. J. R. Beard, of Manchester, and the Rev. E. Higginson, of Hull, are expected to preach.

Lincoln, Feb. 19, 1831.

THE Anniversary of the Southern Unitarian Fund will be held at Portsmouth, on Good Friday, April 1st. There will be service in the forenoon at the General Baptist Chapel, after which the business of the Society will be transacted; and in the evening at the Chapel in High Street. The Rev. E. Chapman, of Deptford, is expected to preach.

THE Annual Sermon for the relief of the necessitous Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, will be preached on Wednesday, the 13th April next, at the Rev. John Clayton's Chapel, in the Poultry, by the Rev. John Burnett, of Camberwell. Service to begin at Twelve o'clock at noon precisely. The subscribers and friends to the Society will afterwards dine together at the Albion Tavern in Aldersgate Street.

Ministerial Settlement.

THE REV. GEORGE SKEY has accepted an invitation to become Pastor of the Unitarian Congregation at Hinckley, Leicestershire.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGICAL.

The Doctrine of the Trinity founded neither on Scripture, nor on Reason and Common Sense. By W. H. Drummond, D. D. Third edition. With considerable additions. 5s. 6d.

Objections to Unitarian Christianity considered. By Dr. Channing. 4d.; on common paper, for distribution, 2d.

Hints Illustrative of the Duty of Dissent. By a Congregational Nonconformist. 6d.

Remarks on the present State of the Dissenting Interest. By One of the Laity. 2s. 6d.

A Brief Statement of the Proceedings of the London Presbytery, in the Case of the Rev. E. Irving.

A Treatise on the Nature and Causes of Doubt in Religious Questions. 5s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hinton's History and Topography of the United States. Parts VII. VIII. IX. 3s. each.

Historical Sketch of the Bank of England: with an Examination of the Question as to the Prolongation of the Exclusive Privileges of that Establishment.

Letter to the Right Hon. Francis Jeffrey, Lord Advocate of Scotland.

Castle's Manual of Surgery. Third edition. 10s. 6d.

The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge for 1831.

The Marchmont Papers. By Sir G. Rose. 3 Vols. 8vo.

Crotchet Castle. By the Author of Headlong Hall.

Essay on the Distribution of Wealth and the Sources of Taxation. By Rev. R. Jones.

American Stories for Children. Edited by Miss Mitford. 3 Vols.

Preparing for Publication.

A second Volume of Sermons designed to be Used in Families.

CORRESPONDENCE.

O. P. Q. next month.

Communications received from Te Tace; W. L.; L.; and H.